

THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW

VOL. VI

MARCH, 1906

NO. 9

Garrison, and The Materialistic Interpretation of History.*

THERE is a class of critics which denies the importance of Garrison's services to the country on the ground that all idealists and reformers are mere empty voices, and that none but economic causes affect the condition of men. The world, according to these philosophers, crawls upon its belly, and its brain and heart follow submissively wherever the belly leads. This is known as the "economic interpretation of history," and is particularly affected by Marxian socialists, who believe that state socialism is destined to be established by irresistible economic laws, and that their own idealism and agitation are altogether fruitless; which does not prevent them, however, from laboring and sacrificing themselves for the cause, like the typical idealist. This belief and this behavior is strangely like the Christian doctrine of predestination, the certain triumph of the church, and the fore-ordained election of the saints, which has never interfered with the missionary activity of believers. The disciple of Marx comforts himself with the materialist equivalent of the statement that all things work together for good, and his dogmatism is as strict as that of any Presbyterian sect. It is the old issue of fatalism and free will, the fatalist usually exerting himself to secure his ends much more strenuously than his adversary.

The most complete application of this theory of economic causes to the subject of slavery has been made by an acute so-

*) From Garrison, the Non-Resistant," by Ernest Crosby. Public Publishing Co., Chicago, Cloth, 144 pp. 50 cents.

cialist thinker, Mr. A. M. Simons, in a series of articles in the *INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW* of Chicago during the year 1903. According to him the idealism of Garrison and the Abolitionists—the growing belief in the immorality of slavery and the justice of the demand for freedom, John Brown and his raid, Uncle Tom's Cabin, the battle songs of the North—all these things were phantasmagoria and the people were deceiving themselves.

"The real conflict was between the capital that hired free labor and the capital that owned slave labor."

And Mr. Simons represents the Northern capitalists in the anticipation of a future struggle between themselves and their employes, as deliberately determining that the capitalists of the South should not enjoy the "privilege of an undisturbed industry." It seems to me that anyone who can believe this can believe anything that he wishes to. The fact is that slave labor did not compete with the free labor of the North. The South had a practical monopoly of the production of cotton, tobacco, rice and sugar, and slavery was chiefly confined to that production. The relative cheapness or dearness of slave labor had consequently no appreciable effect on Northern labor; and if it had, it is absurd to suppose that Northern capital appreciated the fact or brought about the war for any such reason. It is true that the North desired a protective tariff for its manufactures, and that the South preferred free trade so that it might have a world-wide market for its cotton. It is true that North and South each desired to control the national government. But no war would have been fought if the South had not seceded; the South would not have seceded unless she had feared for the future of slavery; and slavery would not have been menaced except for the agitation of the anti-slavery people of the North with Garrison at their head.

As a matter of fact, human idealism enters into all the works of man; and the philosophy which asserts that poetry and religion spring from economic conditions and nothing else, is erroneous or at least one-sided. That mind and body are so intermingled that they reach upon each other, is undoubtedly true, and our extreme idealist needs to be reminded now and then that the bread and butter factor must not be forgotten; but to assert that mind is made of bread and butter is going much too far, and it ignores the commonest experiences of human consciousness. Man's wish—man's will—is a force to be dealt with. Even ordinary hunger involves wish and will in the choice of food. Is our present civilization governed partially by the yield of wheat? But wheat itself is a human creation. The first man who tasted a grain of wild wheat and liked it and proceeded to sow other similar grains was moved as much

by fancy as by economic necessity. And there is hunger and hunger. There is a hunger and thirst for knowledge, and a hunger and thirst after righteousness, and many other hungers and thirsts which must all be reckoned with in the study of evolution. And man can see the workings of this side of evolution in his own mind. I have become a vegetarian, for instance, and I am unable to detect any economic reason for my change of diet. I know many others of whom the same is true. In time the increase in the number of such vegetarians will produce an appreciable effect upon the economic condition of mankind, and here clearly will be a change occasioned in large part by pure idealism. The same is true of socialism, and I know many leading socialists who so far from having been impelled to socialism by economic motives, would be economic losers by its victory. And so with the temperance movement, the peace movements, the movement for the prevention of cruelty to animals, and many others. I am conscious and every man is conscious of doing things every day against mere economic interests, and I do not refer exclusively to philanthropy by any means. The millionaire who spends his money on a trip to Europe instead of saving it overrules his economic interests on account of his higher desire for novel experiences, and he does the same thing when he pays for a superfluous ornament on his house. To overlook men's desires is to overlook life itself, and in the record of the living actions of men the thought precedes the thing. You cannot have a dinner without thinking it out beforehand, nor build a house without plans. You might wait till dooms-day for "economic conditions" to roast a potato for you. The will of man must intervene before the miracle is performed, and sometimes he wills to rise above his economic conditions and refuses to bend before them.

In short, the "economic interpretation of history" is equivalent to the brick interpretation of a house (leaving the architect and the owner who ordered it built out of the question)—that is, no interpretation at all. Economic conditions are more often the limitation than the source of evolution. The exertion of our powers is more or less bounded by our materials, and events which are not economically possible are not likely to happen; but things are not yet in the saddle and the socialist movement, with its devoted and self-forgetful leaders, gives ample proof of it. It is curious to note that our extreme materialists call themselves "scientific socialists" and our extreme idealists, who deny the existence of matter, take the name of "Christian scientists." True "science" lies between these extremes and perhaps it is wise to fight shy of those who advertise their "science" too conspicuously.

In the history of slavery the element of human will and

initiative is particularly prominent. A sentimental bishop was the first to suggest the importation of Africans to America in order to relieve the Indians from the labor which their spirit could not brook. It was a philanthropic business at the start. Indians would not work, Negroes would. Here again the human factor asserted itself. The Cavalier immigrants of the South did not like to work, the Puritans of the North did; hence one of the reasons that slavery flourished only below Mason and Dixon's line. Mr. Simons refers to this fact as "one of those strange happenings" called "coincidences." The interesting point lies," he goes on to say, "in the fact that in Europe it was just the Cavalier who represented the old feudal organization of society with its servile system of labor, while the Puritan is the representative of the rapidly rising bourgeoisie which was to rest upon the status of wage-slavery." "Strange happening," "coincidence," "interesting point." This is certainly most naive. There was no reason why slaves should not be employed in the North in raising wheat as well as in the South in raising cotton, except that the Northerners did not want them, and heredity as well as climate goes to account for the difference. Mr. Simons himself quotes from the work of an antebellum author a reference to German settlers who, "true to their national instincts, will not employ the labor of a slave." And in fine, as if to show how little he is convinced by his own arguments, Mr. Simons says of this same volume (Helper's "Impending Crisis"), "This book had a most remarkable circulation in the years immediately preceding the war, and probably if the truth as to the real factors which made public opinion could be determined, it had far more to do with bringing on the Civil War than did 'Uncle Tom's Cabin,' " which involves an admission as to the latter book as well as to the former. Books and arguments and ideals had their leading part to play in the abolition of slavery, and the very adversaries of the belief cannot get away from it. "Public opinion" is and always has been a determining element in history, and it is swayed by novels and agitators and poets. Garrison still has his place in history.

Science vs. Mysticism—A Reply.

WHILE the foregoing criticism by Mr. Ernest Crosby is filled with misconceptions and misinterpretations of the doctrine he attacks, yet on the whole it is about as good a short presentation of the ordinary arguments against the socialist position as I remember having seen. I am all the more led to consider the particular problem which he discusses since one of the foremost socialist papers in the United States has recently taken almost the same position as Mr. Crosby regarding the function of Garrison and his fellow abolitionists.

First as to the misunderstandings. It is a grotesque travesty on the truth to claim that according to the economic interpretation of history, the world "crawls upon its belly, and its brain and heart follow submissively where the belly leads." The socialist never stated that the food desire was the only one influencing man. He has emphasized far more than his opponents that there is a "hunger and thirst" for a great variety of things besides food and drink for the belly. He has never attempted to formulate a philosophy which overlooked these desires, and has always maintained that it was the way in which man satisfied *all* his desires that determined his social institutions. Until the present time society has been mainly concerned with the satisfaction of the "belly desires," and consequently social institutions have been governed by the manner in which these desires were satisfied to a much larger degree than Mr. Crosby may be willing to believe.

The next misunderstanding is one for which there is really no excuse. It is as moss-grown with age as the "don't-want-to-divide-up" and the "coming-slavery" nonsense. This is all the more inexcusable on Mr. Crosby's part since this point was thoroughly explained by Mrs. May Wood Simons in one of the very numbers of the *INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW* containing the articles which he criticises.

I refer to his silly, catchy comparison of Marxism with Predestination, and his sneers at the "fatalist" socialist who still engages in propaganda work. Undoubtedly the old alchemist, who sought to accomplish the transmutation of metals would have similarly sneered at the contradiction of a modern chemist, who should at the same time believe in chemical laws, and still seek to compound drugs. We can imagine the supercilious sarcasm with which a similar reasoner might have

greeted Newton, and how he would have been denounced as a contradictory fatalist if he dared to suggest that bodies could still be moved notwithstanding they obeyed the laws of gravitation. The comparison is a correct one and will bear further elaboration. The man who knows no social laws, who trusts to sentiment and preaching, without considering whether what he seeks to accomplish is in accord with social evolution and the laws of social growth, is exactly comparable to the old alchemist and "medicine man" or witch doctor; while the socialist, who first seeks to discover the laws according to which society must evolve, and the forces by which its structure is determined, and then works in accord with those laws and forces, is the social prototype of the modern chemist and physicist, who studies physical and chemical laws in order to use them.

Chance, luck, incantations, charms, and the "medicine man" philosophy in general, have been driven from all other fields of phenomena save that of society. Just because it is to the material interest of the ruling portion of present society to deny the validity or even the existence of such laws we still have social conjurers who seek to produce results without regard to the laws which govern the forces and phenomena with which they deal. Another reason why social laws are slower in obtaining recognition is found in their greater complexity, and in the fact that each social organization, like each chemical combination, or each species of animal or plant life has its own laws of growth and operation. No body of thinkers who approached the subject from any but the proletarian point of view could avoid the first difficulty in any social stage, and in the stage of capitalism there are also special advantages from this method of approach in meeting the second difficulty. For these reasons it is not pure bigoted conceit, that leads the socialist to claim that he alone has the true position in regard to the great fundamentals of social life and evolution. He is all the more confirmed in this belief by the fact that his philosophy has grown with ever conquering force in all nations of the earth in the face of the most bitter criticism from without and the keenest examination from within. To-day he offers the results of this philosophy, not as presenting a fatalist obstacle to social activity, but as offering a means of intelligent *scientific activity* comparable to that which takes place in all other fields of human endeavor.

Let me say this all over again, so that even the stupidist may never have occasion to bring up this objection again. So long as people thought that diseases were cured by charms, that crops were governed by luck, that plagues were a visitation of God, there was little chance for the rise of the sciences of healing, or agriculture or sanitation. But when it was learned that these things were governed by inexorable "irresistible" laws,

then the growth of the science was in exact degree to the growth of the knowledge of these laws. The same thing is true in the science of society. So long as men believe that social changes come by chance, through the efforts of great men, or inspired geniuses, there can be no social science, nor effective intelligent working for social change. Just as the astrologist, the alchemist and the medicine man occasionally happened to perform their charms or chant their incantations at the particular moment in which the desired change was about to take place, and so got credit for what happened; just so the particular social prophet who was lucky enough to guess which way things were going, before other people saw the trend of events, or who unconsciously worked in accord with the social laws, came to be looked upon by those who accept what might be called the "medicine man interpretation of history" as the cause of the event. On the other hand, when the socialist discovered some of the laws of social evolution and proceeded to act in accord with them for the accomplishment of certain definite social changes he was the social counterpart of the engineer, the physicist and the trained scientist in all other fields, who produce results by the *application* of known laws.

If this does not forever lay the ghost of this "fatalistic" contradiction, then I will simply have to admit that there are those who will still cling to their charms and incantations in the social world just as others continue to carry the left hind feet of grave-yard rabbits.

The third misunderstanding is also an extremely common one, and one for which there is not the slightest excuse, since socialists have over and over again made their position so plain that it would seem that a "way-faring man though a fool" might still understand it. This lies in the assertion that socialists take no account of idealism as a possible social force. Once more, had Mr. Crosby read the article to which reference was previously made, he would have found this objection met. I quote from the article in question to show the density of understanding on the part of those who would still insist that socialists are blind to the existence of these forces. "The systems of justice, morality, etc., which have arisen in previous social stages undoubtedly have a part in determining social institutions to-day." Every adherent of the materialistic or economic interpretation of history since Marx, has recognized this fact. The socialists have done more than this. They have explained the origin and the methods by which these forces work. I continue to quote the sentences which follow the one just given: "But how? They constitute the material upon which present economic environment must act, and they may so resist that environment as to greatly alter it. But when we analyze this back to its ultimate

we find that it is not a conflict between ideas and environment, but a conflict between a past and a present environment." From this fact it follows that an idea which did not correspond to the environment and the direction of social growth would be doomed to disappearance; and if it did so correspond then it would be unconsciously working in accord with the very laws which the socialist points out. In the same way the "medicine man" did sometimes hit upon the proper herbs to cure the patient, but that is a poor argument for "medicine man" therapeutics.

Once more we will try to repeat this thought so that it may be thoroughly understood. The socialist recognizes that ideas are effective in the social realm, just as they are in any other field, only when *applied in accordance with social laws*; just as the ideas of the engineer are only effective when applied in accordance with the laws of physics. The engineer might sit and dream, and then preach and pray and denounce and agitate until the crack of doom and he could not build a sky-scraper out of butter, or a bridge without foundations. In the same way a Garrison might have been crying out against slavery without ever disturbing the status of the negro, if it had not happened that the owners of wage-slaves wanted the government which the chattel slave owners possessed, and got into a war about the matter, in the midst of which they blockaded southern ports, destroyed plantations, burned cities and transformed the negro into a wage-slave.

There is plenty more in Mr. Crosby's general observations that might serve as texts to illustrate the perversity of those who will not see, or upon which to preach sermons on the economic interpretation of history. I shall pass these over, however, believing that none of them present any difficulties to anyone who chooses to apply the principles already explained.

Now as to the particular example which he offers as illustrative of the "medicine man" incantation, idealistic theory of history. According to Mr. Crosby the "element of human will and initiative is particularly prominent" in the history of slavery. I shall not here reproduce the mass of evidence which appeared in the original articles which he criticises.*)

I shall take only the incidents he cites, supposing that, like a good general, he has chosen the strongest positions and that if these are overthrown the whole citadel will be forced to capitulate. He asserts that "A sentimental bishop was the first to suggest the importation of Africans to America in order to

*) The two issues of the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW, covering the period since the adoption of the constitution, can be furnished to anyone who wishes. Price fifteen cents postpaid.

relieve the Indians from the labor which their spirit would not brook." As Mr. Crosby says, "It seems to me that anyone who can believe this, can believe anything he wants to." This is the "medicine man interpretation of history" with a vengeance. Just because a Spanish bishop chanced to suggest to the mine owners of Spain, who were on the look-out for men to murder for money in their American mines, that negroes might be substituted for the Indians, who had shown a disposition to object to being tortured in the underground hells of the new world, are we therefore to believe that it was religious sentimentality that introduced negro slavery to America? Does it sound probable that if this suggestion had not been made that it never would have occurred to the slave-traders, who had been plying their trade for several years before Columbus landed on the shore of San Salvador, that there was a possible profitable market for their wares on the western shores of the Atlantic?

I never represented "the Northern capitalists in the anticipation of future struggles between themselves and their employes, as deliberately determining that the capitalists of the South should not enjoy the 'privilege of an undisturbed industry,'" and there is nothing in the articles criticised that justifies such a statement. That this possibility was foreseen at that time was pointed out by me as a remarkable example of foresight, but too few persons possessed that foresight to make it an effective social force. I would add to the quotations given in my former article the following from John C. Calhoun, as showing that there were those at that time who were able to believe this unbelievable thing, and these the very men who were shaping events — if we are to accept the great man theory of history:

"There is, and always has been, in an advanced stage of wealth and civilization, a conflict between labor and capital. The condition of society in the South exempts us from the disorders and dangers resulting from this conflict; and explains why it is that the condition of the slaveholding states has been so much more staple and quiet than that of the North."

The central point upon which I insisted in my original article, and which I believe I was the first to present in anything like a complete form, was that the Civil War was a struggle between two divisions of the ruling class—the southern chattel slave owner, and the northern buyer of wage labor, for control of the national government, and that the North did not set out with the intention of "freeing" the slave any more than the South aimed at the "enslavement" of the northern wage worker. In the midst of the war, and as a war measure, and certainly not as a result of abolitionist agitation, the Emancipation Proclama-

tion was issued. Up until that Proclamation was issued the Republican Party steadfastly refused to favor abolition. I could easily cite almost numberless proofs of this fact, if it is disputed. But when the negro was "freed" and given a ballot, and was needed by the "carpet-bagger" and the "scalawag" in "Reconstruction" times, then the "freeing of the negro" became one of the valuable assets of the Republican Party, and was worked for all it was worth. Then they began to idolize the old abolitionists, and to claim to have agreed with them all the time.

There are some other rather remarkable statements in Mr. Crosby's work. He tells us that, "There was no reason why slaves should not be employed in the North in raising wheat as well as in the South in raising cotton, except that the Northerners did not want them." There are a few things that seriously interfere with the accuracy of that sentence. First, negroes were "employed in the North in growing wheat" for a while. Second, there was a very good "reason why" that employment was not continued and that was that it did not pay. Third, the Northerners did "want them," and when they found they could not use them at home they very willingly sold them to their southern brethren; like the woman, who became convinced that her jewels were dragging her soul down to eternal damnation, and so gave them to her sister. This myth about the Puritan heredity and morals which led to abolitionism has been exploded so often that it seems a pity to hit it again, but so long as there are those who believe in witch doctors it will still be necessary to repeat the platitudes of elementary hygiene. Says McMaster "If the infamy of holding slaves belongs to the South, the greater infamy of supplying slaves must be shared by England and the North." It was the Puritan owners of the Boston clippers, who stole the slaves in Africa, or bought them with adulterated rum, and then brought them to the southern planters. If the "horrors of the cotton plantation" must be charged to the account of the Cavalier, the Puritan must answer for the ten-fold greater "horrors of the middle passage." In short, both sides believed in, defended and practiced chattel slavery just as far as it was profitable, and no farther.

Mr. Crosby seems to think that he has caught me in a ridiculous contradiction when I stated that Helper's "Impending Crisis" had much to do with bringing on the Civil War. On the contrary, this is an illustration of the point at issue,—that the social agitator is only effective when he works in accord with social laws. Helper showed the unprofitableness of slavery. He demonstrated that it was to the material interest of a great portion of the population to abolish it and to substitute wage-slavery. He showed that the latter increased profits, built cities and railroads, fostered commerce, and raised the price of land.

He called upon the southern non-slaveholders to vote in their own interest and not blindly follow the slavocracy. It was these things that caused his book to reach a larger circulation than any other work filled with dry statistics and dull reading ever reached before or since, and that raised the South to such a point of rage that possession of the book was made a crime in many states, and having sympathized with its circulation defeated John Sherman for the position of speakership of the House of Representatives. The fervid eloquence of "Uncle Tom's Cabin" may have stirred up the sentimental maiden ladies of Massachusetts, but unfortunately (and also unjustly, as I will be the first to agree) they were not in a position to make their voice felt in the affairs of state. But Helper put his hand upon the pocket-book lever, that then, as now, ruled, and so helped, to a slight extent at least, to set the wheels in motion, which eventuated in the victory of the Republican Party, the secession of the South and The Emancipation Proclamation.

That secession was an absolute necessity if the profits in slavery were to be preserved. Chattel servitude could not succeed with the capitalist class of the North in power. The industrial system of the South was so different from that of the North, especially after capitalism had developed, that it required an almost diametrically opposite use of the national government. The influence of the little body of abolitionists in bringing about either the war or abolition was almost infinitesimal, and this just because they were not working in accord with the laws which were governing the society in which they lived.

If Mr. Crosby believes that he can further substantiate his position or prove the error of the materialistic interpretation of history I hope that will continue his criticisms. The socialist, as always, has "everything to gain and nothing to lose," by free discussion, and I cheerfully and gladly tender him the columns of the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW for this purpose.

A. M. SIMONS.

Economic Contradictions and The Passing of Capitalism.

IN the preceding articles we have endeavored to show the purpose of Marx's inquiry into the laws of exchange-value, and how those laws furnish the key to the understanding of the *Workings* of the capitalist system of production and distribution.

We have examined the capitalist system *as it is*, without going into the question of its origin, except to note the fact that it had an historic origin, that is to say, that it is not eternal or even immemorial in its existence but is a historical phenomenon having had its origin within the recorded memory of men.

We have examined some of the tendencies of its development, but only within its confines. We have examined some of the tendencies in the development and distribution of the mass of surplus-value produced *in* the capitalist system while it lasts. The question of its lasting, as to its extent and form, we have not touched upon. We might say, *a priori*; that since the capitalistic system is only a historic phenomenon it will certainly not last forever. While this is true, it is of no importance whatsoever, unless we can say with some degree of certainty that the passing of this system is of such proximity that its end can be seen, and this is only possible if its end is so near that we can discern its form, or rather the form of the system which is to succeed and supplant it. This again, can only be determined, if at all, from an examination of the tendencies of the capitalist system, and the laws governing it, followed out to their ultimate and logical results so as to see whether they lead beyond the capitalist system itself. And if so, whither are we drifting?

Should a careful and exhaustive examination of the tendencies of the capitalist system fail to lead to any beyond, then we must accept the capitalist system as unlimited in duration for all practical purposes. For the social system, which is to succeed the capitalist form of society must be born and developed within the bowels of capitalism, and it will come into existence only after the passing of capitalism shall come about as the necessary and logical result of the full development of the laws of its own being. And it will be long before the end of the old system, and the birth of the new one will come, that the signs of decaying old age and of the new germs of life will manifest themselves to the intelligent observer.

The examination which Marx made of the capitalist system has not only revealed to him the laws which govern the production and distribution of wealth within the system, but also the *historical* tendencies of its development which show its place in history with reference to its origin as well as its passing. His work, "Capital," is therefore not only an explanation of the workings of the capitalist system, but also an historical estimate, an appreciation thereof. The sub-title of the work, "A Critique of Political Economy," refers not so much to the theories of the political economists who preceded him with reference to the explanation of the actual workings of the capitalist system, as to their failure to appreciate the tendencies and the laws of capitalism which will lead to its ultimate passing away. According to Marx, the capitalist system of production and distribution is so full of inherent contradictions, that its own development, if the laws of its own existence are permitted to freely assert themselves, *will lead* to its ultimate and speedy destruction." For, not only are the laws of capitalism inherently contradictory, but the development of capitalism has already reached that stage where the contradictions upon which it rests make themselves felt to its own detriment, and the forces and elements which are to work its destruction and supplant it are maturing rapidly before our very eyes. So does the system which is to take the place of capitalism take definite shape and outline, so that its general form and appearance stand clearly before our vision inscribed: Socialism.

Before proceeding however any further with this examination our attention is called to a question which might interfere with the progress of our inquiry unless answered right here. There is perhaps no question which leads to as much discussion, and as contradictory opinions, since the advent of Revisionism, than the question of the relation between the theory of value and socialism in the Marxian system. The cleavage of opinion is in the main along the lines of orthodox and revisionist Marxism, the former claiming an intimate relation and interdependence between these parts of the Marxian theory, and the latter denying it. This alignment on the present question is not very strict, however; and absolutely irreconcilable opinions on this subject are held by Marx-critics belonging to the same camp. A glance into the discussion of this subject will again reveal the almost hopeless state of ignorance of the Marxian theory which prevails even among the ablest of Marx-critics.

According to Tugan-Baranowsky (who agrees in this respect with most orthodox Marxists) Marx based his socialism entirely on what he thought to be the laws of capitalistic development resulting from the peculiarities of the law of value which

forms its keynote. Oppenheimer and Simkhowitch, however, and a host of others, insist that Marx's theory of value has nothing whatever to do with his socialism.

Curiously enough, Tugan-Baranowsky on the one hand and Oppenheimer and Simkhowitch on the other, all claim one and the same passage in Engels as authority in support of their respective positions; which adds no little to the bewilderment of the simple-minded reader. The treatment which this particular passage from Engels has received, and the uses to which it was put, is very characteristic of up-to-date Marx-criticism, particularly of the Revisionist brand: Detached passages, sentences and phrases, from Marx and Engels are bandied about without the slightest attention being paid to the particular context or connection in which they were used, thus often making them yield an entirely different meaning from that intended by the author. The result is that everybody proves by Marx and Engels themselves whatever opinions he pleases to ascribe to them, a most fruitful field is provided for the adherents of the theory of evolution in Marxism, and a plentiful harvest is assured to the gatherer of Marxian contradictions.

V. G. Simkhowitch, who has to his credit one of the wordiest essays on Marxism, published in one of the most learned German magazines, says: "Marx's socialist demands and his theory of value are genetically related, but systematically considered there is no connection whatever between them. In saying this I merely repeat something which is self-evident to every philosophically educated person who has grasped the Marxian philosophy (*Weltanschauung*). Anybody who cares can find specific statements to that effect in Marx and Engels. So says Engels about the relation of Marx's socialism to his theory of value: Marx therefore never based his communistic demands thereon, but on the inevitable breakdown of the capitalistic mode of production which we daily see approaching its end. And in the literature of Marxism this has always been insisted on."

At the risk of being accounted philosophically uneducated we shall have to disagree with our philosophic Marx-critic along with others, for reasons which will presently appear. Just now however it is the passage quoted from Engels that interests us. We must say most emphatically that Engels never said any such thing as he is made to say by our philosophically educated critic. Not that the *words* quoted are not Engels'. The words were used by Engels, sure enough. But their *meaning* is entirely different. For Engels did not say this, "About the relation of Marx's socialism to his theory of value" as Simkhowitch (and Oppenheimer) seem to think, but about something else, which exactly reverses the meaning of the passage. In his preface to Marx's "Misery of Philosophy," Engels says that long before

Marx some socialists attempted to base their socialism on the Ricardian theory of value, claiming that since, according to Ricardo, labor is the source of all value, the laborers are entitled to all the value produced, which means to the whole social product. And then he goes on to say:

"The above application of the Ricardian theory, namely, that to the workingmen, as the only real producers, belongs the entire social product, *their* product, leads directly to communism. This application is, however, as Marx points out in the passage quoted above, economically formally false, for it is simply the application of ethics to economics. According to the laws of capitalistic economics the greatest portion of the product *does not* belong to the workingmen who produced it. We may say: this is wrong, it must not be. But that has nothing to do with economics. We merely say by this, that this economic fact is opposed to our moral feelings.

Marx therefore never based his communistic demands thereon, but on the inevitable break-down of the capitalist mode of production which we daily see approaching its end."

Our philosophically educated critic evidently got things somewhat mixed. Marx never based his communistic demands on the *moral application* of the Ricardian, or his own theory of value. Nor on any morality for that matter. Therein he differed from the utopian socialists who preceded him and from such of those who followed him, who, like Bernstein for instance, have returned to the moral application of economic theories. That is why Bernstein and the rest of the Revisionists do not see the connection between the Marxian theory of value and his socialism. Any theory of value will do for them as long as it permits, or they think it permits, the *moral* application which they are after. And as any theory might be made to yield such a moral to those who look for it, they have become indifferent to theories of value in general. Not so with Marx. His socialism is scientific as distinguished from utopian based on moral applications, in that it is the result of "the inevitable breakdown of the capitalistic mode of production." But this inevitable breakdown can only be understood and explained by the aid of the Marxian theory of value, that is why his theory of value and his socialism are so intimately connected in his system. Marx based his socialism on his theory of value. But on its economic results, not on its moral application. And it is due to the lack of understanding on the part of his critics of what Marx conceived to be the economic results of his theory of value, that the discussion of the relation between his theory of value and his socialism is still going on, and his and Engels' writings are still being put to all sorts of uses.

The law of value which lies at the basis of capitalism contain within itself according to Marx, a mass of contradictions which lead in the development of capitalist society to the formation of a series of antagonistic elements which must ultimately result in its breakdown. While these contradictions and antagonisms are developed by the same economic process, they are not all of a strictly economic nature, and may have results of what is usually considered a moral character.

While the facts themselves which will lead to the displacement of the capitalist system must be of a strictly economic nature, that is to say the capitalistic mode of production and distribution must become a fetter upon production before it can be overthrown, the actual power which will overthrow it, or at least the form which it will assume in the consciousness of the men who will do this work, may be of a moral or ethical nature. For man possesses the peculiarity of placing absolute standards on relative matters, and he calls moral everything that accelerates his progress on any road which he may be travelling, and immoral everything that retards this progress. When he finds, therefore, that any given arrangement is in his way he declares it to be immoral and fights it with all the force of his "moral nature."

He may, therefore, be depended upon to make a moral issue of, and lead a crusade against, anything that will stand in the way of his economic progress. It is to the economic facts of capitalism that we must therefore look for the basis of socialism.

In order to properly appreciate these facts, we must go back a little to the beginning of our examination of the capitalist system. We have there noted the difference between the wealth of capitalistic society and that of the forms of society which preceded it. We have noted that difference to be in the fact that capitalistic wealth is an aggregation of commodities. This, as was also already noted, is due to the circumstance that the purpose of capitalistic production is different from that of any former mode of production.

This difference in the purpose of production, production for the market instead of for use has wrought a change in the process of distribution of the social product between the different social elements which are to share therein. Under former systems of production this process was a very simple one, and the persons engaged in it were conscious and well aware of what they were doing. It was an extra-economic process, in a way, the real economic process being confined to the process of production. It was in the capitalist system that the process of distribution first became an unconscious, "natural," and economic process, by the addition to the process of production of the cir-

ulation-process of commodities, as part of the general economic process of society, and that part of it in which the distribution of the produced commodities among those entitled thereto is to take place.

From the capitalist standpoint the circulation process of commodities is the most important of the economic processes. Not, however, because it is only by this process that the produced commodities reach their social destination, the consumers, but because it is in this process that all value, including the surplus-value, the cause and aim of capitalistic production, is realized. Until realized in the circulation process, all value produced for the capitalist, "necessary" as well as "surplus," is only potential value, liable to be destroyed at any moment by some change in the social conditions of its production or distribution. In order that the capitalist class may obtain its surplus-value, the whole value must not only be produced but consumed, either absolutely or productively. And in order that the individual capitalist may obtain his share of the fund of surplus-value created for his class, the value in the production or circulation of which he is economically engaged must be consumed as far as he is concerned, that is to say, it must reach his immediate consumer.

This process of the realization of value and of the distribution of the surplus-value in the circulation-process of commodities is presided over by the God of capitalism—Competition—who, as all the world knows, is "the life of trade." The share of the surplus-value which each individual capitalist obtains depending on his success in this competition, the source of all surplus-value has been lost sight of, and the importance of the circulation process grossly exaggerated. It has, however, a real and vital importance to the capitalist class, for it is here that the surplus-value produced elsewhere is actually realized.

The essentials of capitalism are therefore three. Private Property; a free working class; and Competition. Private property in the means of production is, of course, at the foundation of the capitalist system as it is of all societies divided into classes. In this it does not differ from other class-societies which preceded it. Not so with the other two elements. They were almost unknown to the social systems which preceded it, but are absolutely essential to capitalism. We have already seen how important a role competition plays in the realization and distribution of the surplus-value among the members of the capitalist class. It also plays an important part in determining the relative amount of the surplus in all the values that are produced, as we shall have occasion to see later.

This however, depends on the third element, the free working-class. The working-class in order to serve as an efficient

instrument of capitalist production must be absolutely free. "Free," as Marx says, both from personal bondage and from the ties of property. Were the workingmen to be burdened with property, the whole edifice of capitalism would be impossible for the commodity, labor-power would then be absent from the market and the possession of the necessary and surplus-values would then be united in the same person, which would extinguish all difference between them. Production of commodities would also be next to impossible were the workingmen not free personally so as to be able to sell their labor-power to the highest bidder. Competition among the producers would then be impossible. For competition implies equality of opportunity, whereas under such conditions the opportunity of production would depend on the possession of workingmen. Besides, production or abstention from production would then depend not on the choice of the capitalist but on the number of workingmen he possessed. He could not produce if he possessed none, and would be compelled to produce if he possessed them. For it is of the essence of a slave that he must be fed, and consequently worked. The presence of these three elements together turns the means of production into "Capital," and gives the laws of capitalism free play. Hence, free trade is the typical policy of capitalism, as is the "free" employment of private property, personal liberty and right to contract, with all that it implies. And protection in any form, or the interference with property and liberty in any manner, is a sign of either an imperfectly developed capitalism, or of a capitalism in a stage of decay and tottering to its fall.

What, then, are the tendencies of the development of these elements of the capitalistic system? How do they influence one another in the course of their development? And how is the production and realization of surplus-value, the aim and purpose of capitalistic economic activity affected by the sum-total of these influences?

The growth of capitalism, in so far as it is not merely expansion over an increased area, but development of force and power, means the rapid accumulation of capital, more particularly of machinery of production and circulation. All the great masses of our wealth consist of this machinery with the exception of that part of it which consists of land, which, as we have seen, gets its value from the reflex action of this machinery. The accumulation of machinery does not mean, however, the mere piling up of machinery upon machinery, that is to say, it does not mean the mere *addition* of machinery of the same kind to that which already exists. The process of accumulation starts out, of course, by addition of machinery of the same kind. But it does not proceed very far in that way. The real spring of the process consists in the constant invention of ever newer, and

costlier machinery. The economic value of this machinery (that is its value as an economic force) consists in its labor-saving quality. It is of the essence of every new invention that it must be labor-saving in some way, otherwise it is useless to capital. This mechanical law of the accumulation of capital finds its economic expression in the law of the rising organic composition of capital.

The essence of all new machinery introduced in the process of accumulation of capital being its labor-saving quality, and the purpose of its introduction being the replacing of costly live-labor by a cheaper mechanical process, the accumulation of capital is only possible by the constant replacement of live-labor by machinery, by the ever-recurring forcing out of employment of great masses of labor. Thus, this mechanical law of the accumulation of capital, which as we have seen, finds its economic expression in the rising organic composition of capital and therefore in the falling rate of profits, finds its sociological expression in the capitalistic law of relative over-population.

That is to say, that under capitalism a country may become over-populated with *relation* to the needs of capital or of the capitalist class in laborers, and large masses of its population may thereby lose their means of productive employment and therefore their means of subsistence, while the absolute needs as well as means of employment and subsistence are quite sufficient to provide for all its members. The Malthusian law, whatever *else* may be said of it, certainly has no application to the question of population under the capitalist system of society. For aside from the question whether there are any "natural" laws governing the growth of population and of the means of subsistence, such laws, if there be any, would be quite superfluous and inoperative under capitalism. For the very processes by which capital is being accumulated produce an over-population long before the natural limit of population could be reached, and that limit is therefore never reached under capitalism.

The laborers who are continually being thrown out of employment by the introduction of new, labor-saving, machinery, are thereafter absorbed in whole or in part by the process of production, when the new capital, or the old capital in its new form, has had sufficient time to expand and accumulate on the new basis so as to need new "hands." This process of absorption continues as long as the accumulation proceeds on this new (soon to become old) basis of production, and until it has sufficiently accumulated to require, and has actually found, a new basis of production in the further invention of some newer machinery. When this occurs there is a new "freeing" of a mass of workmen from the bondage of employment, and the process begins all over anew.

This constant hunt for additional surplus-value, here by expanding the old processes of production by constantly employing more labor and here by changing the processes so as to narrow down its base of human labor, in short: the process of accumulation of capital, requires, not only a "free" but an *elastic* working class. It necessitates the existence of a "reserve" army of workingmen beside the active one, which it creates and augments by the repeated displacements of live-labor by machinery, and which it uses for the purposes of expansion when accumulation glides along smoothly until the next "fitful" explosion. The greater the accumulation of capital, the greater the "reserve" army which it needs and creates, as compared with the "active" army of workingmen. The "reserve" army is not identical with the "army of the unemployed," but the greater the "reserve" the greater the potential army of the unemployed.

The workingmen under capitalism being "free" and equal, there is no actual line of division between the active and reserve army of workingmen. On the contrary they are in continual flux, men on duty and reservists continually changing place, and the same men sometimes being half active and half reserve. The existence of the reserve army and this relation between the active and reserve armies of the working class have the most deplorable effect on wages, and on the condition of the working class generally. Aside from the destitution caused by the introduction of new machinery among those workingmen who are thereby thrown out of employment and those directly dependent on them, the presence in the market of this superfluous mass of labor-power entering into competition with that part of the working class which does find employment, reduces the price of that labor-power which is employed without thereby gaining any employment for itself. While the value of labor-power is determined by the amount of labor necessary for its re-production, that is, the amount of necessities consumed by the workingmen, this amount is by no means a fixed quantity. It depends on the standard of life of the working class as it has developed in the course of its historical existence in a given country. But this standard, being a product of historical forces, may be raised or lowered. The existence of the "reserve" army, the process of the accumulation of capital which produced it, tends to lower this standard and it needs a lot of fighting to keep it up, not to speak of raising it. Besides, making, as it does the workingman the sport of every turn of the fortunes of capitalistic production, and absolutely insecure in whatever livelihood he does get by reason of the fierce competition of his fellow-workers, and therefore dependent on the whim and caprice of his capitalist employer, it tends to degrade his morale, break in him all mani-

festations of the spirit of independence, and to make of him a servile tool of his capitalistic master.

But right here in its influence on its first requisite, a free working-class, we encounter the contradictory nature of capitalistic development. The very processes which tend to reduce the workingman's wages, and to lower and degrade him, bring into being those conditions which enable him to forge the weapons by which he cannot only successfully withstand the hurtful tendencies of capitalistic development, but which are destined to work the wonders of his salvation from wage-slavery,—*the economic and political organization of the working class*. The introduction of those very new machines which threw so many workingmen out of employment and so largely increased the "reserve" army, have laid the physical foundation for the organization of the working class by bringing great masses of workingmen together and by rubbing off all differences between them. It has also laid the mechanical foundation for the future greatness of the working class by changing the methods of production from their narrow individual foundation to a broad social base.

No less contradictory is the effect of the process of accumulation of capital in its effects on the capitalist class itself. As we have already seen, the accumulation of capital is accompanied by a falling rate of interest. This naturally tends to retard the progress of the process of accumulation, and works in the nature of an automatic brake. This, however, is not the only way in which the process of accumulation counteracts its own tendencies thereby checking the *tempo* of its growth. Every invention of a new machine, while an evidence of growing accumulation of capital, and itself a means to its increased accumulation, is at the same time the means of an enormous destruction of existing capital. As was already pointed out, our vast accumulations of wealth consist in aggregations of machinery. But every invention of a new machine makes the machine the place of which it is to take, useless, and the capital invested in such machines is therefore totally destroyed. The progress of accumulation of capital is therefore accompanied by enormous destruction of existing capital, which naturally retards the growth of the sum-total of capital. Besides, the invention of new machinery, by diminishing the time necessary for the production of commodities, and thereby lowering their values, lowers the value of *all* existing capital. This, again, has a tendency to retard the process of accumulation, the growth of the sum-total valuation of the machinery and other commodities of which the capital possessed by the capitalist class consists.

The capitalists as a class might regard with complacency these retarding tendencies or automatic checks in the accumula-

tion of capital, for the net-result of the contradictory tendencies is still a rapid enough growth of the accumulated mass of capital to suit even the most exacting of capitalists. But the complacency of the individual capitalists is disturbed by the details of the process which result from these contradictory tendencies, and by the way those details affect their individual fortunes.

For while the net result of the process, as far as the whole mass of capital is concerned, is a pretty rapid growth, this growth is not at all equally distributed among the different individual capitals. Quite to the contrary: the contradictions of the process manifest themselves largely by the extreme rapidity of the growth of some of the individual capitals, and the equally extreme rapidity of the shrinkage, or the total extinction, of some other individual capitals, due to the fact that the benefits derived and the losses incurred by reason of the contradictory elements of the process are not equally distributed among the individual capitalists. Under a system based on competition they could not very well be.

The general process of accumulation of capital, by reason of its mechanical basis alone, leads to the concentration of capital and production, that is to the formation of economic centers whereat are "run together" within comparatively small space and under one guidance large amounts of value in the shape of costly machinery and other means of production, and large numbers of workmen. And the particular way in which this process works its way, by benefiting some capitalists at the expense of others, leads to the centralization of capital, that is the amassing of large amounts of wealth in the same hands, by transferring the capital of those capitalists who lose by the process to those that come out winners. This leads to an increase in the number of large capitalists, whose capital grows at the expense of the general body of capitalists whose number constantly decreases. The chosen few capitalists fatten at the expense of their fellows.

These two processes—the concentration and the centralization of capital—accelerate each other. Particularly does the concentration of capital become a powerful factor in its centralization, by turning over into the control, and ultimate ownership, of the winners in the game whatever the losers manage to save from the wreckage, as well as the belongings of those who have managed to keep their wealth although they lost their economic position. By reason of the concentration of capital, those capitalists who have saved part of their capital, and even those who have managed to keep their capital intact, are unable to maintain their independence and continue in the economic process as independent operators. First, because by reason of the concentration of capital, that is to say, by reason of the fact that, owing to the introduction of improved machinery, a large

outlay of capital is necessary in order to carry on production on the new basis, the capital which formerly enabled a capitalist to operate independently is now insufficient for that purpose. So that even the capitalist who still possesses the amount of capital which he formerly possessed is unable to continue as an independent capitalist. And secondly, even if the amount possessed by such capitalists should be sufficient for the technical needs of the production-process on the new basis, such a capitalist would still be unable to maintain an independent existence for the reason that under the new circumstances, with the lower rate of profit which follows, his capital would not yield sufficient revenue to maintain him, and certainly not enough to permit him to further accumulate. This creates what might be called a "reserve" army of capitalists, or rather, half-way capitalists, whose capitals go to swell the funds of the real capitalists in the time of the expansion of economic activity, and these latter get most of the benefit derived therefrom. These supernumerary capitalists also usually furnish the funds for all sorts of crazy speculative ventures, which in their turn also accelerate the centralization of capital. This "between the devil and the deep sea" class is receiving constant accretions from above owing to the constant squeezing out process of the devil on top by the continued accumulation of capital, and its numbers are as constantly being depleted by its lower strata sinking into the deep sea of wage-slavery. If this process should be permitted freely to work out its tendencies, it would result in society being sharply divided into two unequal divisions: a few enormously rich capitalists on top, and the bulk of society at the bottom. A stage would be reached when by reason of lack of numbers, the capitalists would really cease to be a social class, as a social class presupposes a certain minimum of numbers, and the loss in quantity would turn, for the capitalists, into a loss of the quality of their position as a social class.

Will this process work out these tendencies? And what will be its effect on the future of the capitalist system? According to Marx these tendencies of the capitalist system must run their fatal course, unless the system itself breaks down before the process is at its end. For the contradictions of the law of value which is at the basis of the capitalist system of production and distribution are such that, aside from the sociological results enumerated by us to which they must inevitably lead, its purely economico-mechanical existence is put in jeopardy by the laws of its own development.

The purely economico-mechanical breakdown of the capitalist system will result, according to the Marxian theory, from the said inherent contradictions of the law of value, unless the development of capitalism is in some way arrested or unless the

system breaks down earlier for some other reason, in the following manner:

In the fight for the market among the individual capitalists under the rules laid down by the God Competition, each capitalist in order to survive and succeed must strive to be able to sell his goods cheaper than his competitors in the market, that is, he must be able to produce cheaper than the others so as to be able to undersell them and still make a profit. There are various ways in which the cost of production can be lowered. They all reduce themselves, however, to one proposition: to make the share of the workingman in the product produced by him as small as possible. This may be accomplished either by directly reducing the wages of the workingman, an expedient which cannot always be resorted to for the reason that there is a limit beyond which the wages of workingmen cannot be reduced. The more usual way, therefore, is the one which we have already noted, that is by continually substituting machinery in the place of live labor, by inventing labor-saving machinery. The result, as far as the relation of the workingman to the product produced by him, is the same in both cases: his share therein becomes smaller. It is the rising composition of capital which we have already observed.

There is, however, another phase to this process which is lost sight of by the individual capitalist, but which may have dire results for the capitalist class and the whole system. Beside the desired result of cheapening commodities this process has the very undesirable result of making the purchasing power of the laborer smaller in proportion. In other words, the laborer ceases to be as good a customer as he was before, and, as the capitalist must have a customer to buy his products, whether cheap or dear, and can not sell his products unless he has a customer ready and able to pay for his products, he is evidently placed in this dilemma,—either he must give his workingmen a larger share of the manufactured product in the shape of wages, or at least refrain from cutting down the share which the workingmen receive, or destroy the purchasing power of the workingmen, that is, of his future customers.

This contradiction grows and is enhanced in potentiality with the development of the capitalist system for the reason that the development of the capitalist system consists as we have seen, in this very cheapening of production by the supplanting of the workingman through labor-saving machinery. As the capitalist system develops, that portion of capital which goes to pay the workingman's wages diminishes very rapidly in comparison with the whole capital employed for the purposes of production. The result of this is, as we have seen, first, a falling rate of interest; and second, a growing army of unem-

ployed, a relative over-population. But the same law which creates a relative over-population, an over-production of men, also creates an increasing over-production of goods, as, the larger the army of the unemployed, the smaller the army of workingmen purchasers. This will finally result in the disproportion between that portion of the manufactured product which goes to the workingman and the whole of the yearly product of society becoming so great that the over-production, that is to say, that part of the manufactured product which will find no purchasers, will clog the wheels of production and bring the whole machinery of society to a stop.

The stock argument against this position of Marx is that while the immediate effect of the introduction of machinery is to throw out of employment the workingman employed in the branch of manufacture in which the new machines are introduced, it at the same time of itself opens up new employments. When sifted down, this amounts to the contention that the workingmen who are thrown out of employment in the old industry wherein the new machinery is introduced are re-employed in the machinery producing industry wherein these very machines are produced. This contention is, however, evidently untrue for the following reasons: As we have already seen, the reason for introducing a new or improved machine is a desire to cheapen the manufacture of a product. This cheapening can be effected only by saving labor, and this saving must be a very substantial one in order to make it profitable to the capitalist to introduce the new machinery, because this requires a large outlay of capital. Workingmen are usually paid by the week, so that the outlay in capital for the employment of a hundred workingmen will be the weekly wage of these one hundred workingmen. A new machine, however, which should dispense with the work of fifty of these one hundred men usually requires the expenditure of a large sum of money entirely out of proportion with the weekly allowance of the fifty workingmen whose labor is dispensed with. That is why modern capitalistic enterprise, require such large amounts of capital to properly carry them on. The new machine must therefore not only cost in original price and expenses of keeping less than it would cost to employ the fifty men during the time of service of this machine, but it must also pay sufficient to warrant the large investment of capital involved in its introduction. In other words, the labor-saving quality of the machine must be a very substantial one. A mere small saving of labor will not warrant the introduction of costly machinery, requiring, as it usually does, an entire change of the system of production and large expenditures not only in the buying of the machine itself but also in

its accommodation in buildings, etc., and involving as it does, the destruction of much old capital.

Now, if it were true that the workingmen who are thrown out of employment by this machine can be reemployed in the production of this very machine, that is to say, if it required as much labor to produce this machine as it was formerly required to produce the product which this machine is now to produce, there evidently will not only be no cheapening of production, but on the contrary, production will be more expensive because it will require the same expenditure of work or labor (for the machine and the product together), and a larger outlay of capital. Evidently, this machine must not require in its production the same amount or even nearly the same amount of labor which would be required to produce the products which it produces.

Of course, the same number of people may be employed in producing this machine, but this machine should produce a vastly larger amount of product than was ever before produced without it; but then, the question presents itself,—to whom shall this additional product be sold? The share of the workingman in this largely enhanced product must be much smaller in proportion to what his share was before the introduction of the new machinery, otherwise production will not have been made cheaper. There will, therefore, be a larger product to dispose of than there ever was before, and the difficulty of finding a customer becomes insuperable.

It may be argued that the additional product which the workingmen will be unable to buy up will be taken up by the capitalist. This seems a very simple way out of it, and sounds very plausible. As a matter of fact, for long centuries this is the way things usually adjusted themselves. Under the old slave and feudal systems there never was such a problem as over-production, for the reason that production being for home consumption, it was always a question of how much of the product produced shall be given to the slave or serf and how much of it should go to the slave-holder or feudal baron. When, however, the respective shares of the two classes was determined upon, each proceeded to consume his share without encountering any further trouble. In other words, the question always was, how the products should be divided, and there never was any question of over-production for the reason that the product was not to be sold in the market but was to be consumed by the persons immediately concerned in its production either as master or slave. There was no production for the market, and consequently no overstocking of the market. When, by chance, production increased out of all proportion, the product could

simply be stored away, and it never interfered with the proper prosecution of the industries of the future.

Not so, however, in our modern capitalistic industry. It is true that all of the product with the exception of that portion which goes to the workingman goes, now as before, to the master, now the capitalist. This, however, does not settle the matter finally, for the reason that the capitalist does not produce for himself but for the market. He does not want the things that the workingman produced, but he wants to sell them, and unless he is able to sell them they are absolutely of no use to him. Salable goods in the hands of the capitalists are his fortune, his capital, but when these goods become unsalable they are worthless, and his whole fortune contained in the stores of goods which he keeps melts away the moment the goods cease to be marketable.

Who then, will buy the goods from our capitalists who introduced new machinery into their production, thereby largely increasing their output? Of course, there are other capitalists who may want these things, but when the production of society as a whole is taken, what is the capitalist class going to do with the increased output which can not be taken up by the workingman? The capitalists themselves can not use them, either by each keeping his own manufactures or by buying them from each other. And for a very simple reason. The capitalist class can not itself use up all the surplus products which its workmen produce and which they take to themselves as their profits of production. This is already excluded by the very premise of capitalistic production on a large scale, and the accumulation of capital. Capitalistic production on a large scale implies the existence of large amounts of crystallized labor in the shape of great railroads, steamships, factories, machinery and other such manufactured products which have not been consumed by the capitalists to whom they have fallen as their share or profit in the production of former years. As was already stated before all the great fortunes of our modern capitalist kings, princes, barons and other dignitaries of industry, titled and untitled, consist of tools and machinery in one form or another, that is to say, in an unconsumable form. It is that share of the capitalist profits which the capitalists have "saved," and therefore left unconsumed. If the capitalists would consume all their profits there would be no capitalists in the modern sense of the word, there would be no accumulation of capital. In order that capital should accumulate the capitalist must not, under any circumstances, consume all his profits. The capitalist who does, ceases to be a capitalist and goes under in the competition with his fellow capitalists. In other words, modern capitalism presupposes the saving habit of capitalists, that is

to say, that part of the profits of the individual capitalists must not be consumed but saved in order to increase the already existing capital.

As a matter of fact, this saving habit, of which the apologists of capitalism make such a virtue, is really enforced upon the capitalists. It is a *sine qua non* of capitalism itself. The very statement that improved machinery has been introduced in any industry already implies the fact that the capitalists of that industry have "saved" enough out of their share of the product manufactured by the old modes of production to be able to manufacture the new machinery or buy it from its manufacturers, and thereby increase the capital employed in their business. The same reason for "saving" which existed before the introduction of the new and improved machinery and which caused its introduction, namely, the competition of the market, which compels each capitalist to accumulate capital out of his profits, continues to exist and cause the further accumulation of capital and the further introduction of new and improved machinery. He cannot, therefore, consume all of his share in the manufactured product. It is evident, therefore, that neither the workman nor the capitalist can consume the whole of the increased product of manufacture? Who then, will buy it up?

H. B. BOUDIN.

(*To be continued.*)

A Peculiar Scientist.

THE articles signed Charles H. Chase in the January and February numbers of the REVIEW are rather too remarkable to pass unanswered.

It has been said — and I believe it is partly true — that the Socialist movement is woefully lacking in a sense of humor. To be sure, the sordid ugliness of proletarian life under capitalism is not very conducive to mirth. Be this as it may, what we lack in conscious humor is fortunately made up by a few unconscious humorists that we occasionally meet on our path.

When Cervantes' dashing hero — the immortal prototype of all unconscious humorists — made his famous charge against the windmill, he found out a few things. He found, for instance, that his lance was not quite stout enough. Before the attack, undoubtedly, he thought differently.

The materialist monism of the Socialist philosophy is based on modern science. Overthrow the latter, and the proletarian structure will fall.

Bold knights have ventured to try, and the arena is littered with broken lances, shattered shields, split buckles, and other smashed up paraphernalia.

Let us examine the latest attempt in this line. I do not care, for the present, to discuss the difference between modern science and the philosophy based on it; a difference about which Charles H. Chase seems to be ignorant. I will only criticize his science, which he is pleased to call "materialism."

To begin with, he states that "Dalton's theory of atoms is so crude and irrational that it has been abandoned by all scientists, except as to its convenience as a working hypothesis, without the possibility of its having any elements of truth in it." Indeed! And still the entire science of modern chemistry is based on just Dalton's theory of atoms. Very few chemists of to-day would dream of questioning the conception of the atom? To be sure the atom idea, like everything else, has had its growth and development corresponding to the increased knowledge of facts. And to-day it is stronger than ever. I know it is a trick the metaphysical mind often plays on itself to consider a thing out of its historical and evolutionary connection. I suppose the derivation of the word "atom" — indivisible — given by Dalton for convenience' sake, because at the time there seemed to be no means to split further the atom by

chemical or other means. I suppose this derivation of a word (and the associations it will bring in his brain) is the particular nail the metaphysician uses in this case to hang himself on. He hangs nothing else.

The belief that the chemical atom is composed of some smaller unit (or units)—not necessarily hydrogen—entertained by practically all chemists of note since the atom idea was first conceived seems to be justified in these latter days by the results derived from the study of the radio-active substances, to say nothing of the spectroscopic results of Lockyer, Rydberg, and others. These discoveries have not destroyed the atomic theory but on the contrary enriched and developed it.

Finally, let me add that Dalton's theory of atoms never pretended to explain gravitation, nor molecular, nor even chemical attractions, and consequently cannot be said to utterly fail to give us a rational theory of the constitution of matter.

The speculations by Mr. Chase regarding what he calls the Ionization theory of matter must be passed on for the present until he explains what he means by it, if indeed, he means anything. There is an "ionization" theory of solutions, but not of matter, except possibly in that rich and peculiar literature called newspaper science. Or may be he means the corpuscular theory? Who knows?

After having pointed out the contradiction between the properties required for the æther by the theory of vortex atoms and by the theory of light—a real difficulty, which, however, will soon be solved—and having made the statement—though unsupported by any fact in the discussion headed by it—that "materialistic conceptions cannot be harmonized with facts," Mr. Chase proceeds to use his heavy artillery. He has discovered what he calls "A Paradox of Physics and Mechanics." Shades of Galilei and Newton! Ghosts of Helmholtz and Clark Maxwell! Spooks of Boyle and Gay-Lussac and Avogrado! Come out from your retreat in the "spiritual" world, read the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW for January, 1906, and learn what arrant frauds you are!

If any of the gentlemen mentioned would happen to come back to find out what was the row, I imagine he would first ask to know the charge against them. They would read it, and then proceed to emit as hearty a laugh as spirits may indulge in without losing their decorum.

Mr. Chase has discovered an awful contradiction between the preservation of energy and what he calls the preservation of motion. Let us analyze the case he brings up. Two balls of unit mass. One in motion with the velocity of two, the other at rest. Let them collide so that the first one delivers one half of its motion to the other. Without further analysis he pro-

ceeds, "The momentum before the collision is two, and the energy also two. After collision the motion is two, but the energy one unit only. Query: What has become of the unit of energy which has disappeared?"

In all humility I wish to state that the brick I am going to heave is so easy to let go that I do not claim the least credit for it.

Mr. Chase, the only way by which a ball such as you assume, can impart half of its motion to the other ball previously at rest is to strike it so that the second ball will move in a direction deviating forty-five degrees from the original direction of motion of the first ball. The two balls after the impact will move in directions having an angle of ninety degrees between them, each with a velocity equal to the square root of two. Figure out the total energy before and after the impact, assuming that no energy has been lost in vibrations. You will find it to be two in both cases. Also figure out the component of velocity of the first ball along the impact line. This component is the square root of two. After the impact it all has been delivered up to the second ball. Where is the loss of motion along that line? There is none. The whole trouble comes from the fact that Mr. Chase does not know the nature of that law he is talking about. It is simply this: The sum of the quantities of motion *parallel to any fixed direction*, of two rigid bodies influencing one another in any possible way, remains unchanged by their mutual action.

For instance, this sum before the collision along the original line of direction of the first ball is two, and after the collision the sum of the quantities of motion parallel to that line is again two.

I might add that the assumption he makes of a gas in which all molecules but one are at rest is a contradiction in terms—the molecules of a gas are never at rest—and give him a lengthy and fully satisfactory explanation of the "paradox" he has conjured up, but lack of space forbids. I believe, also, that no more discussion is needed regarding this strange vagary of Mr. Chase.

Instead let us proceed. On page 408 Mr. Chase complains that "materialistic philosophers have eliminated all such notions as force..." and on the next page he asks us to explain the nature of potential energy. Why, as soon as any force has been explained as derived from motion, the corresponding kind of potential energy—that being merely a product of force and distance—has then proved to be derived from actual energy. In Newton's time we had a great and varied collection of forces, many of which are now explained as functions of motion. This does not necessarily mean that the idea of force has

been abandoned. It merely implies that it has been brought into synthetic connection with the more fundamental idea of motion. For instance, nobody hesitates to talk about and figure with such a thing as the pressure of a gas merely because it has been demonstrated that this pressure is derived from the *vis viva* of the molecules.

As soon as the nature of the force of gravitation is known the "mystery" of the potential energy of the stone Mr. Chase talks about, will be solved just as the one time "mystery" of the potential energy of a compressed gas already is explained.

On page 410 Mr. Chase admits that the theory of LeSage combined with that of vortex atoms might possibly explain "gravity" and the transmission of radiant energy. "But for chemism and other molecular and interatomic forces it is entirely powerless to afford an explanation." Is Mr. Chase ignorant of the reason that brought both Helmholtz and William Thomson to develop the theory of vortex atoms? In both cases those men of tremendous intellect decided to try if they could not find an explanation for chemical and molecular attractions. Incidentally, they had to show that a vortex ring theory would not conflict with other facts of science, such as gravitation and transmission of light. They did not explain the nature of chemical force but they blazed the trail for some distance in the right direction.

Mr. Chase finishes the January installment with a ludicrous speculation on the atomic weights that certainly needs no comment whatever. Still I might point out that if the atoms are made up of smaller units, which most chemists of to-day believe, how could there possibly be a continuous series of atomic weights, I might add that lead is not the element with the highest known atomic weight of 206.4, as Mr. Chase seems to think. Bismuth has 208.5, thorium 232, and uranium 240. But such things are trifles.

Before I leave the January installment I wish to quote the following passage from page 411.

"Many other questions, quite as pertinent, to be drawn from the chemical and physical properties of matter bring forth no answer from the materialist; they can have no answer but in the assumption of an intelligent Creator, or the assumption of *one Infinite Intelligence and Power of which all other intelligences and powers are individualized fragments.*"

I will now proceed to put the above quotation in juxtaposition to the following one from the February number, page 463.

"We cannot conceive of the union of a number of mental units to form another mental unit. The same difficulty arises in conceiving the human mind and consciousness as made up of

lesser mental units and consciousnesses, as we find in conceiving a separate and higher consciousness of a body of individuals."

Query: Can one "intelligence" be composed of many smaller "intelligences," while one "consciousness" can not be composed of many smaller "consciousnesses." If so, why?

In the February number Mr. Chase touches on the question of the dissipation of energy. His conclusions are mainly correct. It seems to me, however, that this difficulty, for many years a real one, has finally been overcome by the latest discoveries about radium. In the breaking up of the atom, energy of high potentiality is formed from energy of low potentiality. This, however, has connection with a theory on the evolution of matter which I am going to publish in the future, and must be left for the present.

Mr. Chase explains this formation of energy of high potentiality by "life so overruling and directing the chemical forces that they form compounds such as are never formed in the absence of life." He makes the (as yet) true statement that all of our organic chemistry in the laboratory is confined to tearing down organic cells, the building up of a single cell has never been effected except through the agency of life.

To begin with, I wish to point out to Mr. Chase that the radiant energy of the sun is of very high potentiality, and gives a perfectly satisfactory explanation whence comes the energy to dissociate the carbon dioxide, and build up the plant.

In answer to his statement regarding our failure to produce life from unorganized matter in the laboratory—for that is what it amounts to, "building up a cell," as he calls it—it is but necessary to point to the history of organic chemistry, from Wöhler's production of urea in 1828 to Fischer's sugar syntheses in these latter days and say like this: True, we do not know everything as yet, but the achievements of the past and the work of the present are pregnant with promise for the future. We are not going to quit just yet. We shall not sit down and do nothing.

For indeed, it is doing nothing or worse, it is a mental *and moral* declaration of bankruptcy to weakly turn back to the mystic and so-called idealistic halfway stations of the past. God and the whole collection of "spirits" are simply those things we don't know. In the past we planted a god in every nook and corner not yet explored by us. In the sky we put our gods. As we began to know about those various places we removed our gods from there. No longer is Thor chattering around in the heavens heaving his hammer at the giants. The picturesque gentleman is removed from there because we know that thunder and lightning are electric phenomena. The God of the time of

Reformation was a different God to the emasculated abstraction that serves the "religious" purposes of to-day. With our gods we have also left behind us some of the "spiritual" notions of bygone days.

To-day the time is ripe for the greatest generalization yet made by man. Atomic and molecular forces, electricity and light and gravitation all those phenomena will be brought together into one great synthesis, and the forward step thus taken by the human mind will leave far behind some of the intellectual odds and ends that we are now burdening ourselves with. Materialist monism is the philosophy born by the struggles between the old ideas and the new and growing and coming generalization, it is the philosophical form of the Revolution of the Ages.

I might stop here, but I cannot help making an observation in regard to that dear old doctrine of the free will so petted by the metaphysicians, a doctrine, by the way, on which may be raised and have been raised some elegant structures defending political and economic tyranny.

The serious objection is made by many longfaced gentlemen that if this doctrine be destroyed all morality will disappear. I answer: What of it, I have no property to worry about, and all our present morality is a property morality.

Undoubtedly here is a point overlooked by so many of our most well meaning philosophers. Their metaphysical training also makes them ask us strange questions. They ask the revolutionary proletarian, they honestly and sincerely ask: If Socialism will come any way, what is the use of you hustling so to make it come? Why do you exert yourself?

The proletaire will answer, "My dear sir, I am sitting on a tack, and I am trying to get off." The metaphysical gentleman may not be able to see the point. The proletarian, however, can understand the point, because he can feel it.

But I have already departed from my original plan. My intention was to criticize the science of Mr. Chase, not his philosophy. This I have to leave to some philosophy sharp. The movement has some middling fair ones. Comrade Untermann, please step in, and attend to Mr. Chase.

HJALMAR WESTLING.

Materialism in its Relation to Socialism and Progress.

III.

DETERMINISM AN INEVITABLE CONCLUSION OF MATERIALISM.

WITH all the variations of materialistic philosophy as to its fundamental assumptions, there seems now to be a unanimity as to the statement that all phenomena are in their last analysis but matter, ether, and motion. And by no circumlocution of language or jugglery of reasoning can such a philosophy result in anything but the most rigid determinism. We start with fortuitous pushes and stresses of the assumed matter and ether. These by chance differentiation are resolved into rhythmic motion and vibration. By chance combinations of various particles having a variety of motions, more and more complexities arise. As certain degrees of complexity are attained, we have sound, heat, light, electricity, life, mind, and rational thought in an ascending series. But all these phenomena occur in accordance with certain laws of attraction and repulsion of the particles of matter. Any system of particles unaffected by forces outside the system, can only change from one configuration to another in ever recurring cycles, or repetitions. By the operation of its own internal forces and by the action of incident forces from without, are the only ways in which a system can be changed in configuration. Now any change effected in either of these ways is in accordance with the fixed and unalterable laws of mechanics, and can have but one resultant. There can be no possible deviation from the motion determined by the eternal laws of matter. The human individual is as fixed and pre-determined in his action as any mechanism. He who strikes the murderous blow is driven by the same inevitable laws of matter as is the locomotive, which goes as cheerfully into the open draw-bridge as over a smooth track.

NO COMPROMISE BETWEEN DETERMINISM AND LIBERTARIANISM.

Many materialists attempt to evade this conclusion by giving place for a little freedom—freedom between certain limitations. But such compromisers, while unaware of the complete surrender involved in their admission, do, in fact, give up the whole con-

tention. The most ultra free-will advocates contend for free will only under limitations; to remove limitations would be to make the individual omnipotent, an attribute impossible, except it may be to God himself. All finite beings must be limited, though one may move between narrow limits and another between much wider ones. But the moment the slightest choice is introduced into the organism, that moment a superior being is created,—as superior to the passive stone or machine as order is to chaos. The more logical of the materialists see this dilemma, and that there is no compromise, no half-way, or neutral ground, between determinism and free will. They accept determinism with all its consequences. Note the recent utterance of Hugh O. Pentecost, formerly a popular New York clergyman, in an address before the "Sunrise Club" of that city:

"I tried in my youth to read and understand the philosophers and metaphysicians. I gave it up. It was too hard for me. Then I settled it all for myself. Right and wrong, good and bad, moral and immoral, ought and ought not, have no meaning for me. The happiest moment of my life was when I found I'd eliminated my conscience, root and branch, and had no moral sense whatever.

"I got there by this process. I went back to nature. I found that one single principle exists in the universe—seeking the line of least resistance. We simply do always the thing which it is easiest to do under given circumstances.

"Good and evil are all gammon and spinach to me. From the martyr at the stake to the most abject criminal on the gallows, we are all doing the things we do because it is impossible for us to do anything else.

"If you'd get rid of conscience and all that tommyrot, you'd have the solution to every problem in life. I've no fear of God or the devil. I have no desire to go to heaven and no dread of going to hell. Every temptation I have in the world I yield to—every one. And I'm not a bit different from all of you. I haven't any higher nature at all—nor any lower nature. I propose to yield to every temptation. I only have to be sure it is a temptation. If it is—good-bye, I'm gone.

"If I wanted to get drunk, I'd get drunk. If I wanted to beat my wife, I'd beat her. If I don't, it is because I'd rather not. It's more comfortable. Shall I blame another man who drinks and beats his wife because it gives him joy?

"Character? There's no such thing as character. Those persons have good character to me who have those desires which I consider beautiful desires and act on them."

DETERMINISM IN ITS RELATION TO ETHICS AND PROGRESS.

Mr. Pentecost puts somewhat bluntly what is the logical and inevitable ethics of materialism. But he should go further; it was certainly a great waste of energy to enlighten his hearers of the Sunset Club, since all of their acts were determined before and he could in no way affect their action. Or, to put it in another light, if he was one of the predetermined forces to affect and guide the action of his hearers, then he went impelled by forces which he could not resist, and which move him about as passively as a feather on the crest of an ocean wave. But imagine anyone dictating to Mr. Pentecost, or even foretelling what he will do, then we would surely discover whether he has any volition or power of choice. Any fool can say after a fact or act, that it was caused by certain forces; and *a posteriori* arguments seem to be the stock in trade of determinists. And certainly, if Mr. Pentecost or any other man actually believed in determinism, he would be content to float passively down the stream of time with no care for, and no effort to change, his own condition or the inevitable flow of events. He would seek the easiest possible place, the balmy air, the most exquisite pleasures of sense and mind, and let the world wag as it will. All effort is folly and self-gratification the only good thing. In the light (or darkness rather) of such a philosophy there is no meaning to the world; love and hate, joy and despair, life and death are but unmeaning and fortuitous accidents amid the clash of atoms and the crash of worlds. Convince the world of the truth of this philosophy, then will there be an end of all progress and all civilization—nay, the life of the lowest beast will be better than man's; for the beast is conscious of choice and exercises it.

NO REAL BELIEVERS IN DETERMINISM.

But the fact is that no man believes in determinism; his every conscious act gives such unreason the lie. There is no fact of consciousness, no bit of knowledge brought home with more convincing force than this; that when two or more possible alternatives are placed before an individual, he is able to choose one of them to the exclusion of the others; and that, when he has made a choice, he is conscious that he might have made a different one. It is only when a philosopher finds that his philosophy has landed him in the quagmire of absurdity and contradiction that he has recourse to that capsheaf of all absurdities, determinism.

That the so-called scientific socialism should be placed on so lame and irrational a philosophy is one of the idiosyncrasies of the human mind; and that socialism should deify a philosophy

which, could it be galvanized into life and made general in belief, would be the destroyer of the cause of socialism, is quite incomprehensible.

ALTERNATIVE PHILOSOPHIES.

The materialist, however, answers our objections to his philosophy by objecting to ours, whatever it may be. It is not my intention here to enter upon any extended defence of alternative philosophies; but it will not be amiss to show briefly the status of dualism, idealism, and theism in the general belief of mankind.

Dualism, which may be designated as the old fashioned, common sense belief of mankind, held by most men since the dawn of history, in one form or another, but which we are accustomed to refer to Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle, still commands the belief of the great majority of the civilized peoples of the earth, if not, even, of the uncivilized peoples. It encounters the same difficulties, in attempting to give a satisfactory explanation of the ultimate constitution of matter, as does materialism. It makes, also, in addition to the assumption of matter, the assumption of spirit, equally difficult to explain, and the substance of which eludes our senses as completely as does the ether of present day science. But once admit its fundamental assumptions, it is able to explain both the mental and so-called physical phenomena, encountering but few of the difficulties that beset materialism at every step. It goes hand in hand with interactionism and theism as correlative and supplementary philosophies.

Idealism, while a much younger philosophy than dualism, and generally dated back only to the time of Kant, though some of the ancients had much in common with it, is a philosophy which encounters few, if any, of the difficulties of either materialism or dualism. It assumes only our conscious self and ideas (sensations, perceptions, and thought) for which we have the best data of cognition of any in the whole realm of knowledge. The so-called external or material world is symbolized only to the mind through the media of the senses, and the existence of the material in the sense of the non-mental is denied, or, at least, ignored as being beyond the realm of our knowledge. The permanency of certain symbols, however, under similar conditions of mind, seem to argue for something substantial and material in the world with which we come in contact. But psychophysical idealism, which attributes mind to every material thing and phenomenon, knowledge of which reaches the mind through the senses, and explains all phenomena as a contact of the mental with the mental, apparently, at least, gets over the difficulties commonly urged against idealism. Yet so convincing are our

senses, and so accustomed are we to put absolute trust in the report of our senses to our minds that it is with difficulty the student of philosophy can educate himself to the belief that the symbolism of the senses is of an ideal world and not of a material one. There is, however, no more difficulty in this than in our educating ourselves to the belief that the earth is round and rotates on its axis, instead of a flat, immovable body with the heavens rotating about it. Indeed, all of the more abstruse propositions of modern science involve quite as much difficulty in belief as the propositions of idealism. Yet, doubtless, because of its apparent opposition to the empirical facts of science, and common sense as well, it has no wide-spread belief among the masses. But this must be said of it, that, with the simple assumption of consciousness, which all must admit or deny all criteria of knowledge, idealism meets with the fewest difficulties of any fundamental philosophy yet propounded. I must, therefore, contend, in view of all these facts, that the fight for supremacy in the philosophical world will be between the forces of dualism and idealism, with materialism *hors de combat*.

Again, the correlative philosophy of materialism is atheism, while the correlative of dualism and idealism is the philosophy of theism. By theism I do not mean the crude anthropomorphism held to by uneducated religionists; that has been handed down to us from our superstitious forefathers, and is rapidly disappearing before the better reason and scientific light of modern times. By theism I do mean the belief in a God immanent in nature, guiding and controlling all with infinite wisdom, power, and fixity of purpose. The teleological idea is everywhere; we cannot escape the obtruding design in everything in nature to which we give our careful thought and study. With all the efforts put forth by materialists to create an orderly universe by the automatic action of brute atoms, they are as unefficacious as a stone-heap to build itself into a beautiful and commodious residence. *Ex nihilo nihil fit*; and we may also say with equal force: *Ex chao ordo non fit*.

NO PHILOSOPHY YET PROPOUNDED CAN EXPLAIN ALL.

It is not to be expected that man will ever be able to fathom all the mysteries of Nature and Mind; yet his progressive spirit is such that he will always struggle to square all phenomena by the criteria of reason. The positivists ignore these criteria when they refuse to consider cause and satisfy themselves with sequence merely. And a more serious error is that which may be characterized as the dogmatism of science, often dignified by the term, "scientific method." This "method" rejects all that

the investigator does not understand, and refuses to look beyond phenomena for any "metaphysical" reasons.

That which involves irreconcilable facts, difficulties, and absurdities must be erroneous in some particular; and when we run against such facts, difficulties, and absurdities in our theorizing we must revise our theories. By this method have all accepted theories of knowledge been evolved. But a theory should not be rejected because of difficulties, since the theory may be so modified as to remove or evade the difficulties. The Copernican System of astronomy and the Nebular Hypothesis have suffered great changes from the form in which they were originally propounded; and a theory which is yet in a very unsettled state as to fundamentals and details is the Theory of Evolution. Most educated people are now evolutionists; but there is the widest variation in belief among evolutionists.

These brief comments on other philosophies are really outside the questions at issue; and they have been made merely to give the reader an idea of the philosophies opposed to materialism and their present status. Far be it from me to say that they can give a rational, complete, and satisfactory explanation of all phenomena; but I would say, merely, that they are infinitely more satisfactory to the demands of reason, design, and progress than is materialism. And here I rest my case until I have heard the arguments of my opponents.

CHAS. H. CHASE.

Resignation of Joseph M. Patterson.*

It was through a common belief in the cause of Municipal Ownership of municipal utilities that I first became acquainted with you and in this letter of resignation I desire publicly to express how my views on this subject have changed. They have not diminished. They have enlarged. I used to believe that many of the ills under which the nation suffers and by which it is threatened would be prevented or avoided by the general inauguration of the policy of Public Ownership of public utilities. But my experience in the Department of Public Works has convinced me that this policy would be not even one-fourth of the way sufficient.

Take the case of Great Britain where municipal trading has been developed to a high and successful degree. The problem of the unemployed there is becoming one of tremendous and sad intensity. The evils of capitalism are, as far as one can judge of them, hardly affected by municipal trading.

Take the case of Germany where government ownership of railroads has been inaugurated and the municipal ownership of public utilities is paramount. In that Empire, the rich continue to grow richer and the poor to grow poorer with an acceleration hardly less than that so evident in the United States.

Since you have been inaugurated as Mayor of Chicago, you have sought and in spite of the sneers and opposition of your critics, you have sought most successfully to further the cause of Municipal Ownership and I have in a far minor way, since my induction in the office to which you appointed me, sought to diminish the amount of special privileges in our City. Of thousands of instances which I might cite, let me respectfully suggest that you draw your own conclusions from the following two or three: The Illinois Tunnel Company, operating under a franchise from the city which provides that its conduit shall always remain twenty-seven feet below city datum, have sought continuously to evade that franchise provision. You may remember that last December it applied in most cryptic terms for a permit to run its cars up practically to the surface at the Canal Street Depot. This application was refused, again made and again refused. Thereupon the Tunnel Company sought to steal in the connection early one Sunday morning. They were caught and stopped. Within a week

*) We have omitted the opening paragraphs of the letter dealing with the details of administration of his work and suggestions for his successor. See editorial department.

they made the same attempt again and were again stopped. This time their employees were arrested. Of course the fault lay not with the employees but with the officers of the Corporation. I inquired of the State's Attorney of Cook County whether the officers of the corporation could not be imprisoned for their offense, viz. the attempted stealing of the street. I brought forward the fact in my inquiry that it would be easy enough to imprison a man for stealing a loaf of bread; but an examination of the statutes showed that there was no penal offense and that nothing could be done.

Another well-known instance is that of the Illinois Steel Company which had filled in Lake Michigan land worth between five and ten million dollars. This land so filled in belonged to the people of the state of Illinois. About this there is no question that our laws and our legal machinery are so framed that recovery is impossible save at the end of a long lawsuit and even then it is most doubtful. The lawsuit has been initiated. If corruption is not meanwhile successful, the suit will drag on for at least four or five years. You and I both know that at the end of that time it is exceedingly improbable that the State of Illinois will recover much from the Illinois Steel corporation, because the land so filled in has been covered with factories, docks, slips, etc., which conduce to capitalistic activity. To interfere with them would "interfere with business," which cannot really be done.

In the downtown department of the City of Chicago, there are hundreds of bay-windows projecting beyond the building line. These bay-windows may have been put there by virtue of a Council order or ordinance, in which case the Council order or ordinance was unconstitutional. But practically none of these bay-windows have been removed. All that we have been able to do is to charge a very moderate rate of compensation. The compensation so collected has been illegal because laws do not permit of the alienation of part of the sidewalk. However, we sought to collect this compensation because we thought it was better than nothing.

And the sincere resistance accorded us has been amazing. One would suppose that a set of incendiaries, anarchists, communists and all the other "ists" which are the terms of greatest reproach in our language had sought constantly to destroy the interests of our community. It never occurred to the owners that they were getting something for nothing. They simply realized that they were making money by having the bay-windows and paying nothing for them, and therefore nothing else mattered to them.

The Department has several times caught water thieves. It

has on examination of a meter found that its mechanism had been so altered as to register but one-fifth of all the water which passed through the meter. But application to the State's Attorney evolved the fact that our present laws—framed in the interests of capital—practically make it no offense for capital (i. e. the privileged few) to steal from the community, (i. e. the unprivileged many). Consequently, nothing could be done to the water thieves.

Again and again we ran up against the injunction business. A particular collection of capital (a firm, corporation or rich individual) would steal something from the community—for instance, valuable land. When we tried to dispossess capital—injunction. And capital would hold the land or other valuable asset of the community during the pendency of a long and troublesome lawsuit.

The whole body of our laws as at present framed are ridiculous and obsolete. They are designed always to uphold capital at the expense of the community. The most potent weapon in the armory of capital is Delay—for Delay induces forgetfulness of the wrong and the chance to corrupt.

Money is so strong now-adays that, given time, Delay, it can in some form or other corrupt most men or if it cannot do that, it can get the crank out of the way.

I realized soon after I took office that to fight privilege under the present laws would be a jest. The cards were stacked in its favor from the start; the dice were loaded and are loaded against the community.

Hence of the insignificant little bit that I accomplished against privilege, not one tithe of a tithe could have been accomplished through the law. What I succeeded in was practically all done in an extra legal (though I think never an illegal) way. To enforce obedience on the part of capital even to the existing laws—and we all know the existing laws are "fair" enough to capital—I was compelled to hold up permits, to use force, to pester, worry and annoy, in ways never contemplated by our present laws. It would not surprise me if such a system of hazing as I was forced much against my will to adopt were now to be made a criminal offense by the next legislature.

It isn't because rich men are bad or a class apart. They are not. But when money possesses them (they practically never possess money) it alters their very souls without their realizing it and it is simple to see why. It is because money is what a man most wants. It is the very dearest wish of his heart, whatever that may be.

Money is power and dominion. It is wine and woman and song. It is art and poetry and music. It is idleness and activity.

It is warmth in winter and coolness in summer. It is clothing and food. It is travel and sport. It is horses and automobiles and silks and diamonds. It is books. It is education. It is self respect and the respect of all others.

No one possesses it but it possesses everybody. In life, money means everything, and therefore, anybody will do anything to get it. It enslaves those whom it possesses and it likewise enslaves in a more sordid way those who have none of it. The man who has money masters the destinies of those who have it not.

Here is an instance as it seems to me entirely significant: In the Civil War, an eminent Philadelphia financier by the name of Jay Cooke lent a considerable sum of money at a low rate of interest, (perhaps at no interest at all; I have forgotten) to the government. His name has come down in this country as a patriot of extraordinary purity, a man who, when the country was in need, was willing to sacrifice a large part (perhaps the whole, I have forgotten) of his fortune to its welfare. His example was so unique that the average history of that time has never been able to get over it.

During the same time, over a million men enlisted and went to the front. They offered not their money but their lives, their blood and their families to the cause in which they believed and no one has deemed them extraordinary; whereas Jay Cooke was extraordinary, because, he did not wring out every cent he could from the necessities of the nation. In other words, it is infinitely more uncommon to risk money than to risk blood.

This example, I believe, shows how much stronger money is than man. A man is expected to risk his life but he is hardly expected to risk his fortune. He would give away money before he would give away life, because if he were to die he would have no money anyway. But he would, and he does seriously, risk life for the sake of money.

I cannot, therefore, see why money, which is the greatest thing in life, should not be more or less evenly distributed, just as the ballot is.

The universal ballot gives every male citizen an equal political opportunity. The common ownership of all the means of production and distribution would give everybody an equal chance at music, art, power, sport, study, recreation, travel, self respect and the respect of others. I for one cannot see why those things should be concentrated more and more in the hands of a few. Two hundred years ago a proposition for equal political opportunity would have seemed more absurd than to-day seems the proposition for equal opportunity in all things on this earth for which men strive.

Capital says that to-day there is equal opportunity for all. In this capital lies, and knows it.

By distributing money evenly, I do not mean to say that all the money in the country should be cut up into equal bits and that everybody should get a bit of it. But, on the contrary, I believe that the ownership from which money springs should be vested in the whole community. In other words, as I understand it, I am a Socialist. I have hardly read a book on socialism, but that which I have enunciated I believe in general to be their theory. If it is their theory I am a Socialist. You will find, and other advanced liberals and radicals who believe as you do will also find, that you are merely bartering with skin-deep measures when you stop short of socialism.

I beg your pardon for having so long trespassed on your time, and I wish you all the good fortune in the world.

Believe me, my dear Mr. Mayor, with the best regards,

Yours very sincerely,

(Signed) JOSEPH M. PATTERSON.

EDITORIAL

Conspiracy to Murder.

Every reader of the REVIEW is doubtless familiar with the newspaper reports concerning the latest outrage against the Western Federation of Miners. On the 19th of last month Comrades William D. Haywood, Charles H. Moyer and several other officials of the Federation of Miners were arrested with secret extradition papers, and without opportunity to see their families or consult attorneys were hurried into a special train and rushed away to Idaho. Next the papers began to be full of an alleged confession by one, Harry Orchard. Just who this precious individual is some of our readers may not be aware. He is the spy to whose house the blood hounds went after the Independence explosion. At the time this took place, the capitalist press all denied or suppressed the facts and he was not arrested or in any way interfered with. Now, however, they are printing the story which they then denied only with the slight change, that they now allege that he was in the employ of the Western Federation of Miners. Then comes a grotesque story of a conspiracy in which the conspirators buried bombs, revolvers, rifles and other paraphernalia of assassination in various parts of the state of Idaho where they could be found by the police in accordance with a pre-arranged "confession."

Next comes the wife of this alleged spy who swears that he died in Death Valley six weeks before the date on which it is claimed he made the confession. Then the officials of the penitentiary where it is claimed he is confined give out word that he is dying of pneumonia or consumption and can not be expected to live until the trial. Meantime we are assured, however, that the confession which it is claimed consists of from seven hundred to one thousand pages (according to the power of imagination of the man who seems to be telling the story) is ready for presentation to the court. Under these conditions we are not surprised that the prosecuting attorney of Idaho has announced that unless some of the talking is stopped he will drop the whole case. Were it not for the terrible fact that the lives of these men were at stake the whole thing would remind one of comic opera.

There is not the slightest doubt, however, that this is all part of a

deliberate plot to railroad these innocent men to the gallows. This plot will succeed unless there is such an uprising of the working class of America as to frighten the conspirators away from their murderous intention. Having removed Heinze, their only competitor, the Standard Oil forces found themselves in absolute control of industrial and political conditions in the Rocky Mountain states. Between them and unbounded profits stood only the resistance of the class conscious working class organization, the Western Federation of Miners. In spite of all the lawless outrages that have been perpetrated against that organization during the years just passed it had continued to grow in strength, solidarity, and aggressiveness. Every effort to fasten upon its leaders the crimes committed by the Employers Alliance had failed. No jury could be found sufficiently corrupt in the state of Colorado, capitalist ridden as that state is, to send them to the penitentiary or hang them without at least some shadow of evidence. So it was determined to spirit them away to a state where courts and juries were thought to be even more subservient.

The response of the working class of America to this attack has been the most striking and gratifying event that has happened in America in recent years. The capitalist forces were depending largely for success upon the antagonism which was known to exist between the Western Federation of Miners and the old pure and simple Unions and especially the United Mine Workers. They felt especially sure of the hostility of the U. M. W. or at least of its helplessness at this moment when that organization is threatened with the largest strike in its history. Judge what must have been their astonishment when, without a moment's debate and by a unanimous vote, the very organization upon which they had depended to assist them in their battle against those men whom they sought to murder voted \$5000.00 for their defense.

The I. W. W. took up the work of agitation at once and prepared and sent out to working class organizations throughout the U. S. thousands of copies of a manifesto calling for the organization of protest meetings and preparation for active assistance in every way. They also secured the services of Clarence S. Darrow to assist in the defense of the accused men. All the socialist papers responded promptly to the occasion with an editorial denunciation and with calls for action. The National Secretary sent the following telegram to Comrades Moyer and Haywood:

"Chicago, Ill., Feb. 19, 1906.

Chas. H. Moyer; Wm. D. Haywood,
Penetentiary, Boise, Idaho.

The purchased confession, the secret special train makes the conspiracy of Capitalism complete. Russian methods make pertinent the question: Is Colorado in America? Rockefeller reported successfully evading summons. Platt and Depew safe in the Senate.

Your comrade,

J. MAHLON BARNES,
National Sec'y."

The *Appeal to Reason* arranged for a special correspondent to be on the field during the trial and has promised to use all its energies in placing the truth before the American workers. Meantime developments in the West would seem to indicate that the capitalists were just beginning to awake to a realization of what they were stirring up and that already the conspiracy was falling to pieces.

If it is made evident to the capitalists of the entire country that further prosecution of these men will mean the capture of a half dozen cities and perhaps some states by the socialists with a good bunch of socialist members in congress this fall there is no doubt but what the hanging will be interfered with. This is the strongest response that can be made. The outrage is naturally one which is arousing thoughts of meeting, violence with violence and it is certain that if these lawless and murderous tactics are long pursued that the working class of America will be aroused to the point where the campaign of assassination on the part of the capitalists will be met by open revolt on the part of the workers. At the present time, however, all talk of armed resistance is foolish. There are not enough men inspired with the feeling of independent revolt in this country as yet to do anything effective. Until more have been roused to the point where they know enough to vote straight, it is pretty certain that their shooting would not be strikingly accurate. The same is true of the utilization of the general strike. Without one half the provocation which has existed in Colorado, Italian laborers tied up the industries of that entire country until the wrongs were righted. At the present time, however, with the larger portion of the labor organizations of the United States in the hands of men who are in secret or open alliance with the capitalist class any effective concerted national action is out of the question. General strikes for defense of working class rights are not planned at Civic Federation banquets. The only immediate action which can be taken is to arouse an indignation which can later be directed into intelligent channels of revolt and to gather funds which may be used to fight for the lives of these men at the moment. It may be true that the "blood of martyrs is the seed of the church" but comrades Haywood and Moyer are too good men to be looked at in any such cold way as this. Seldom has the labor party produced two finer men than these. We have no doubt but that the other men who are arrested are equally worthy of confidence and esteem, but it so happens that only the first two are known to us personally. We can not believe that any jury which would look into their faces would fail to see that whatever else they might be guilty of, a secret conspiracy to hire any one else to do murder would be absolutely out of the question.

We publish herewith the letter of Joseph Medill Patterson resigning his position as Commissioner of Public Works of the city of Chicago. The full significance of this letter may not be apparent to those who do not live in the neighborhood of the city of Chicago and are not familiar

with recent events in the Dunne administration. It will be recalled that Mayor Dunne was elected on the most radical municipal ownership platform of any man in America. Mr. Patterson was the one man in his administration of whom it was claimed that he was really accomplishing anything. He had taken up the fight for reform more aggressively and more effectively than perhaps any other man in official position in the United States. He was the one "living example" to which the Hearst papers were pointing as showing the possibility of what could be done by following out their platforms. When he now comes out with the statement that he was practically accomplishing nothing and declaring that the entire radical public ownership position is inadequate that opinion is in every sense of the word a highly expert one. It is condemnation from the lips of the man who perhaps better than any other man is best fitted to speak on the subject.

The debate which took place in Los Angeles on Feb. 20th between Comrade Arthur Morrow Lewis and Job. Harriman is another significant item proving, from another point of view, the facts brought out by Mr. Patterson's letter. Mr. Harriman, who had behind him the prestige of having been the vice-presidential nominee of the socialist party in 1900 and whose ability as a debator will be conceded by all socialists, attempted to justify the formation of a radical union party on the coast. He was met by Comrade Lewis, championing the position of the socialist party. The resulting vote of the audience showed that Harriman had suffered an overwhelming defeat in the debate.

SOCIALISM ABROAD

FRANCE.

The general elections for the Chamber of Deputies take place during the month of May and the parties are now engaged in active campaign. In spite of all sorts of "unity" the socialist forces are still somewhat badly broken up. There will be many "socialist" candidates in the field aside from those put forth by the party.

The *Vorwaert's* Paris correspondent says, "Down with Socialism will be the watchword in all sections of the bourgeoisie. As a consequence socialism will play so great a role in public life that even its opponents must use the name. The coming electoral campaign will see 'true socialists' of all possible shades shoot up."

Eugene Fourniere in the *Sozialistische Monats-Hefte*, writing from the opportunist point of view, is of the opinion that no great gain can be expected. It must be remembered in this connection that the *Syndicalists*—the partisans of the general strike and exclusive trades union activity, have also tended to disrupt and disorganize the socialist movement. Those who know the history of socialist progress, however, will see in this momentary disintegration the signs of an upheaval which may be depended upon to crystalize into a definite socialist movement in the near future.

DENMARK.

The elections have recently been held for the Upper House of the Councils. These elections are carried on under a system with restricted suffrage so that it is very difficult for the proletarian party to make its strength felt. In many cases the socialists entered into an alliance with the Liberals as their only means of gaining representation. However, in eight cities they put forward purely social democratic tickets and in six of these were completely victorious. In six other cities the ticket contained only one Liberal the remainder being socialists, and in all these cases the ticket was victorious. Throughout the whole country the socialists elected 153 representatives, the Radicals eighty, and the Reactionary combination 182. The socialists succeeded in electing some representatives in fifty different cities. The extent of the socialist advance is shown by a comparison with the last two similar elections. In 1894 the Conservatives were the dominant party in a majority of the cities. The Social Democrats only elected ten representatives in eight cities. At the next election in which they could take part, that of 1900, the Conservatives lost their majority in the class elected by universal suffrage and 208 representatives were gained by the allied democracy composed of the Left

and the Social Democracy. The socialists gained 56 representatives in 25 cities. As has just been noted the present election gave them 155 seats in fifty cities. The heaviest loss is suffered by the Reform party of the Lefts which in many cities has been completely wiped out as an independent party.

SWITZERLAND.

The more that is known about Switzerland the less it appears to be the workingman's Paradise that middle class reformers of this country have always hailed it to be. A recent investigation into child labor has shown a most terrible condition of affairs. There is no protection offered in Switzerland against child labor except in factories and an investigation was recently set on foot by the *Gemeinnützige Gesellschaft* (Social Welfare Society) as to the extent to which children were employed in home-industries, agriculture, and other non-factory industries. Unfortunately the inquiry was not complete since the administration of several of the Cantons, among others, that of Zurich, refused to give it their support. Of the 24 Swiss Cantons only 13 took part in the inquiry. In spite of this incompleteness the investigation showed a most wretched picture of the exploitation of child labor. The inquiry was carried on through the teachers. It was discovered that out of a total of 279,551 school children 117,126 were regularly employed in agriculture; that 17,762 were employed in house industries or hand work, and that 14,194 were employed in other industries, all of a productive industrial character. Altogether therefore 149,083, or 53 per cent., of the children were engaged in some regular profit making occupation. In one Canton three-fourths of the children worked from four to six daily, many of them much longer, in addition to their school hours. 2,790 worked regularly on Sunday also. 12,000 were compelled to work during extraordinarily early hours (from 4 to 6 in the morning) and about five thousand at extremely late hours (from 9 to 11 P. M. and later). The exploitation of those who had "places" with farmers were especially bad. The teachers reported that these were most shamefully exploited, a 12 to 15 hour labor period being the rule. The result of this exploitation showed itself naturally in the school. Many teachers declared that fully 40 per cent. of the children were stunted by the labor demanded of them. For all these children the school is only an additional burden. They are all mentally backward.

There has recently been a split in the Swiss Social Democracy. This is really but a falling off of those members of the old *Grütliverein*, which joined the organization in a body in Nov. 1901. This body was almost exclusively a small capitalist organization but it had been slowly permeated by socialist propaganda until a majority of its membership had become socialists. Now, however, those who were not really willing to accept the socialist position have fallen away.

ITALY.

Recent elections held in Turin showed the regular steady increase in the socialist vote although a combination of the reactionary forces triumphed for this election. The socialist vote for the last three elections is as follows 1899, 6373; 1902, 7868; 1905, 8681, and at the present election 10,283.

HUNGARY.

The Austrian situation grows more acute constantly. The demand of the Hungarians for universal suffrage has thrown the whole political situation into confusion. Parliament has been called three times and as many times immediately dissolved by the crown. An attempt is being made by

the Hungarian bourgeoisie to turn the revolutionary energy into nationalistic channels and there is apt to be an armed revolt with a disruption of the Austria-Hungarian empire. The socialists are meanwhile carrying on an ever increasing campaign for universal suffrage and whether the expected disruption takes place or not their demands can not be long postponed.

GERMANY.

There seem to be many signs of a movement on the part of the German authorities to once more inaugurate a reign of legal repression against the socialists. The editor of the *Leipziger Volkszeitung* has recently been condemned to a year and nine months imprisonment for the circulation of an article which would not have hitherto been considered illegal.

According to the *Reichs Anzeiger* the Prime Minister Von Beulow was interrogated in the upper house of the Prussian Landtag as to when steps were going to be taken to suppress the socialists. The questioner asked: "Is any further proof needed that the suppression of the Social Democracy is not possible by the application of legal methods and that we have now reached a period where other methods must be created in order to overthrow these revolutionary gentlemen. A strong and well developed law must be thought out to produce this effect We think, however, that if the party found itself met with a somewhat sharper application of present laws much could be accomplished without far reaching new measures: The present government, to be sure, does its best in fighting the Social Democracy, but as far as we can see it has now reached a stage where the government has no effect on the masses."

Count Von Beulow replied to this: "The government maintains that there is no necessity of new legislation, but it will certainly make use of all the legal means at its disposal The decision as to when the moment has come when it will be necessary to apply to legislative bodies in order to secure strength and means with which to meet revolutionary uprisings must be left to the responsible government Much more is it necessary that the present parties should suppress all internal strife and unite against the common enemy and build the way to a coalition of all bourgeois elements for the battle against the revolutionary Social Democracy. The emergency is too great for us to permit ourselves the luxury of fighting one another I would send forth from this place my warning to the capitalist parties, stand together against the common enemy."

According to the *Neue Preussische Zeitung* the socialists are making gains into ever new fields. This paper bewails the horrible fact that in South Germany a Social Democrat has recently been elected as a chairman of a local *Kriegerverein* and that "instead, as has always hitherto been the custom, of adjourning the assemblage with shouts and hurrahs it was dissolved with the words, "Freedom, equality and brotherhood." The capitalist journal is, of course, of the opinion the assembly that should do such a thing as this should be at once expelled from the national organization.

The *Neue Hamburger Zeitung* in a panic stricken editorial entitled "Das rote Gespenst" (the red spectre) is shivering over the possibility that the German socialists may take a lesson from the Russian *massen-streik* and apply it at home.

ENGLAND.

The result of the English labor elections were given quite fully last month. The final count gives the following result:

Names	Votes	Members
Liberal.	2,669,339	309
L. R. C. & S. D. F.	334,920	29
Tory	2,406,731	157

In this table those labor men like Burt, Bell, Burns, Steadman, etc., who ran on the Liberal ticket without the endorsement of the Labor Representation Committee are designated as Liberals. There are some twenty of these which have been given in the majority of the reports from Europe as belonging to the labor group. In considering the vote of 334,920, which will probably be taken as the figure for the socialist vote of Great Britain from now on, two things must be remembered. First, tending to reduce it, that many of those endorsed by the L. R. C. were not socialists. Against this, however, must be set the fact that out of nearly six hundred districts, candidates were run in less than one hundred. This was because of the very high parliamentary expenses which are required to be deposited before a candidate can be offered. The consequence is that it is certain that there were a large number of socialists who were either disfranchised or else compelled to vote for capitalist candidates. There were certainly more of these than there were non-socialist voters voting for labor candidates. This is especially true when we consider that there were nearly as many candidates who ran directly as "labor men" with Liberal support, and that in nearly all cases local socialists endorsed and voted for these men where no socialist candidate was present. It is probable therefore that the socialist vote of Great Britain is somewhere in the neighborhood of half a million. As to the tactics of the new party and their effectiveness it is still too early to say much. There will be an Independent Labor Group in parliament with at least twenty-nine members. This group has elected Keir Hardy as its leader. He has announced that it will not be the policy of the group to attempt simply to occupy any position merely as holding the balance of power, and indeed at the present time the Liberals have a clear majority over both Conservative and Labor men,—but that a definite positive policy will be taken up. Among the measures receiving their support will of course be relief for the unemployed, better school facilities, etc.

Blatchford declares in the *Clarion*, that: "The Socialist movement is not a small local revolt which can be quelled with smooth flatteries and pretty promises. It is the beginning of a world wide revolution. It will save the Liberal press and the Liberal leaders a great deal of time and trouble and disappointment if they will make themselves acquainted with the books and journals of the socialist and Labor parties. As long as there remains a poor man, a hungry or untaught child, an overworked or dishonored woman; as long as the unfortunate are persecuted, and the undeserving are exalted; until the earth belongs to all men, and all men are free, and masters and servants are no more—the socialists will fight for socialism, and will relentlessly attack and ruthlessly smash any and every party that opposes the emancipation of the race."

In the same strain Comrade Hyndman closes an able editorial on, "The Labor Party, Its Dangers and Opportunities," in *Justice* with these words:

"It is a grand chance to give a lead to Great Britain, to Europe, and to the world. None will rejoice so heartily as we shall if it is taken full advantage of. But whatever happens, we out-and-out Social Democrats know full well that the future is ours. Socialism in England has come to stay both in and out of Parliament, and many of the young men who read this article will live to witness and triumph in the greatest social revolution of all time."

THE WORLD OF LABOR

BY MAX S. HAYES

As has been foreshadowed in the REVIEW, another great crisis is impending in the mining industry. The miners have held their conventions, made their demands, negotiated with the operators, and at this writing both sides are feverishly preparing for the struggle that seems almost inevitable. There is, of course, always a chance that some sort of compromise may be patched up before the first of April, but it is a slim chance, indeed. At least a portion of the operators—especially those who have great stocks of coal in reserve and who are bitterly opposed to the “meddling unions” that interfere with their coupon-clipping exercises—are anxious that a national suspension take place, for then, they argue, while the workers are being starved into submission, the price of coal will soar upward in leaps and bounds. It is variously estimated that from 8,000,000 to 12,000,000 tons of coal are piled up for just such an emergency as threatens and since the adjournment of the Indianapolis convention the piles have steadily grown in size, so that certain of the operators claim the market can be supplied with coal for six months to a year. Then, again, they would have the non-union bituminous districts of Pennsylvania and West Virginia to fall back upon. It is a fact that all the available vessels in the ports of Cleveland, Ashtabula, Buffalo, Conneaut, Lorain, and other shipping centers along Lake Erie have been chartered and loaded with coal, at an additional cost of 10 to 15 cents a ton for storage, which is to be transported to the West and Northwest when navigation opens and sold at increased prices. Usually the railways do not begin to receive lake coal until the middle of March, but in the past six weeks the roads have been choked with heavy shipments. The situation is not unlike a great stampede after a battle, when every effort is made to prevent as many of the valuable stores as possible from falling into possession of the enemy. But the war has not yet begun. When the engagement does begin, if no settlement is affected, an army of upward of half a million workers—representing perhaps 3,000,000 human souls—will be in the field opposed by a mere handful of well-groomed plutocrats entrenched behind impregnable forts of class privilege. Not only will the army of workers be entirely unarmed, but they will be weighted down by empty stomachs and suffering and starving women and children. The fat men in the forts, on the other hand, have but to wave their hands when bands of Cossacks, the iron and coal police and militia, and the bewigged and besmirched harlots of the bench with their injunctions, and governors and mayors and sheriffs in platoons will ride down upon the defenseless mob and cut and slash right and left, and all because the mob claims the right to a living wage for mining coal to prevent society from freezing to death

and to keep the wheels of industry moving. Now this may be an ideal state of affairs to the mind of your average pure and simple "labor leader," who has a cornpion fit when you suggest the advisability of political action to capture the powers of government, which includes the military Cossacks, the judicial and administrative jumping-jacks, but to a plain, ordinary, everyday member of the rank and file, who is not heralded in the capitalistic newspapers as being "great," such tactics appear to be the height of imbecility and downright stupidity. However, the economic condition in which the miners are situated will probably dawn upon them with full force some time in the not distant future, when it can be taken for granted that they will move together politically in a mighty army as they are now accustomed to do industrially. The miners, much like the farmers, are a simple folk. Their humdrum existence in small, remote villages and camps makes them such. It is only when a great national struggle portends or is in progress that they become fully aroused, and they display all the self-sacrifice, fortitude and heroism of men engaged in actual battle. Whether a national suspension comes in one or both of the mining fields on the first of the month, or whether some compromise is arranged that may tend to postpone for a year or two the struggle that must finally come between combined capital and organized labor, it is certain that the miners will have the undivided support and sympathy of every trade unionist and socialist on this continent. When a battle is on it is nothing short of high treason to quibble and split hairs over matters of detail and tactics. The fight must be made, no matter what the drawbacks are.

If the miners' strike begins on April 1st it is not improbable that a struggle will begin simultaneously on the great lakes which will finally result in affecting at least another hundred thousand men. The marine workers, like those in all lines of industry, are confronted by a powerful combine which seeks to insert an entering wedge to destroy the organized forces of labor that stand as a menace to the master class and dispute the right of the latter to conduct "their business" as they choose without giving the slightest consideration to those who do their work. There is a little dark cloud on the horizon that is gradually growing larger and may develop a hurricane. It will be remembered that a year ago the lake carriers fought the mates and pilots, who had an independent organization, and defeated the men. The bosses declared that the pilots had no right to organize and demand recognition as a union, but must occupy the position of representatives of the owners on board vessels. Otherwise, they said, their properties would be at the mercy of the unions completely. Recently the Lake Carriers' Association held a convention in Detroit, where the gauntlet was thrown down to the Lake Pilots' Protective Association, which was formed after the last strike and chartered by the American Federation of Labor. The shipping "masters" announced that under no circumstances would they treat with this particular union. Subsequently the pilots held a convention and instructed their executive officers to reply to the ultimatum. A few weeks ago the latter met in Cleveland and drafted the following manifesto, which is herewith given in full because, firstly, it is an important document in the present industrial crisis, and, secondly, it was generally suppressed by the daily newspapers for obvious reasons:

"Regarding the position taken by the Lake Carriers' Association, through its executive committee (which is controlled by the United States Steel trust, tug trust and other corporations), to say the least, is rather a peculiar one. They themselves have a union (capitalistic, of course), which has for its purpose the advancement of their own interests, and according to their way of thinking is entirely proper.

"This trust of trusts does, however, recognize the right of some of

its employes to organize into unions which include the masters (with the understanding that the officers of the organization will be selected from and by the vessel-owners) just as fully as the pilots, have a union which is virtually recognized by the Lake Carriers' and Lumber Carriers' Associations.

"While it is true that there is no written contract, yet they submit their proposition to the vessel-owners, specifying the wages and conditions under which they will work, which is accepted by the vessel-owners without change. This certainly implies the existence and recognition of a contract, which becomes legalized by both sides accepting and complying with its mandates.

"In the face of all this, the lake carriers contend that the pilots (mates) must not join a labor organization. The Lake Pilots' Protective Association is a bona fide labor union, affiliated directly with the American Federation of Labor, and has come to stay.

"The declaration of war issued against the pilots' union is but the beginning of the hostile policy which the lake carriers have been contemplating for some time against all marine organizations.

"We, therefore, in our effort to obtain justice and fair play, appeal to all marine workers, as well as organized labor generally, for their moral support and endorsement, in our efforts to bring about the same privileges as other wage earners enjoy, viz., the right to organize.

"There is no middle-of-the-road course; the unions that are not with us must be considered against us. We hope to receive a frank and positive expression from all wage earners, particularly the marine organizations, as we are confident that if the vessel-owners realize that we have the support and sympathy of all our co-workers, they certainly will see the advisability of modifying their present position."

The gravity of the situation will become all the more readily understood when it is explained that not only the officers of the pilots, but the rank and file are determined to test the strength of the vessel-owners, but likewise the fealty of their affiliated organizations. The pilots are really under the wing of the International Longshoremen, Marine and Transport Workers, who organized the former in opposition to the licensed pilots controlled by the Seamen's Union. Whether this rivalry will tend to aid the bosses, or whether the dual organizations will stand together when the critical moment arrives, is a question that seems to be undecided at this writing. In discussing the outlook for the spring when navigation opens, National President Bush, of the pilots, said to me: "I believe a fight is coming, and if the shipping combine should succeed in defeating us they will attack the longshoremen next. But if even the oilers and water-tenders stand by us we can tie up practically every vessel that floats upon the lakes. I am certain that we will have the assistance of other marine organizations." Another officer, who exacted a promise that his name must not be used, said: "It is now up to Dan Keefe (president of the longshoremen) and his men. We will refuse to work with scabs on the vessels or play into the hands of those on shore. If organization means anything, we have a right to the same treatment that other marine workers are demanding and receiving. The longshoremen cannot consistently do anything else but stand with us, and the sailors will hardly dare to oppose us."

When it is considered further that a strike on the lakes might spread into other trades the possible magnitude of the impending struggle on the first of April or thereabouts will begin to be appreciated. While the miners might succeed in shutting off production quite thoroughly, they or other unions working in harmony with them must likewise be prepared to block distribution of the mountains of coal that have been stored for emergency purposes or that may be mined in the scab districts of West

Virginia and Pennsylvania. Otherwise the struggle would be prolonged and result in a contest of endurance, with the miners at a disadvantage. Aside from the industrial advantage that might be obtained by tying up lake traffic just at a time when the miners are engaged in the greatest struggle in their history, the two men at the head of the two great organizations are the warmest of personal friends. It was Dan Keefe who, in the presidential campaign of 1900, during the first anthracite strike, played the part of the "mysterious stranger" and carried on negotiations between Mark Hanna, the dominating political boss, J. P. Morgan, the ruling industrial boss, and John Mitchell, whose word was law with the miners, and finally arranged the settlement. Both, Keefe and Mitchell, are vice-presidents of the A. F. of L. and usually chum together and vote as a unit on all questions. Both must realize that a critical period has arrived and that if either of their organizations are defeated it would mean a terrible blow to the trade union movement. Therefore, it is not improbable that the marine workers would play an important part in a struggle between the miners and operators in paralyzing the transportation end of the business. Meanwhile Gompers appears to be completely overshadowed. Nobody seemed to notice him or pay the slightest attention to what he thinks or says. In fact, Coal Baron Robbins has declared in no unmistakable terms that the Civic Federation will not be permitted to "butt in" on the fight. If Gompers had any backbone, and dared to fight the capitalists as hard as he does the puny Socialists who meet with his displeasure, he would call a special session of the A. F. of L. executive board immediately and issue a proclamation to all organized labor to contribute funds to the unions involved or go on strike whenever or wherever they were forced to use or handle scab products. But it is doubtful whether Gompers will do anything but utter ponderous platitudes about conciliation, meditation, arbitration and procrastination, so that the workers will continue to have hell and damnation forever and anon. If only somebody would kidnap the "Little Napoleon" and maroon him on an island for a couple of years, they would be doing the American labor movement an inestimable service. But Gompers is safe (and sane) from the capitalist viewpoint.

When Moyer, Haywood and Gillespie were kidnapped in Denver and spirited into Idaho, Standard Oil once more displayed its claws. That another foul plot has been concocted by those imps of hell, the Pinkerton thugs, every intelligent workingman believes, and while it is not my purpose to discuss this latest outrage here, as it will no doubt be referred to in the editorial department, I will make the prediction that several million union men and Socialists, who are watching every move that is made in this Western drama, will not stand for a second Haymarket martyrdom. If Moyer, Haywood and other officials are railroaded to the gallows it will be a sorry day for the conspirators in high places. Lawson, Tarbell, Lloyd and other writers have already shown that the grand dukes in Standard Oil will not hesitate to stoop to the most infamous crimes to gain their ends. The terrorism of Standard Oil from Coeur d'Alene to Cripple Creek may triumph for a time, but those who sow the wind must reap the whirlwind sooner or later.

BOOK REVIEWS

TRADE UNIONISM AND LABOR PROBLEMS. *Edited by John R. Commons.*
Ginn & Co. Cloth, 628 pages, \$2.50.

This is one of a series of books applying what is known as the "case method" to social problems. Papers by various authors treating different phases of the trade union question are brought together. These papers are almost entirely descriptive in character, treating either of the forms of organization, events or policies of the trades unions. There are twenty-eight such papers in the volume under consideration not including an introduction summarizing the most salient points brought out by the articles. The most valuable papers are those contributed by the editor and especially those treating of the "Teamsters of Chicago," "Labor Conditions in Slaughtering and Meat Packing" and the "Sweating System in the Clothing Trade." The paper on the introduction of the "Linotype" by George E. Barnett is also an instructive study of almost the only successful attempt by trades unions to meet the machinery problem. One of the most striking things about the book is the fact that although it is made up of current articles it was found necessary in a large number of cases to add foot notes explaining important changes which had taken place since the writing of the original article. In many cases still further changes have taken place in the few months that have elapsed between final compilation and publication. The entire situation in "Slaughtering and Meat Packing" and "The Chicago Teamsters" for instance has been completely changed and in both cases the unions have almost disappeared from the field. Another paper which deserves especial attention is the one by J. W. Sullivan on "The Printers' Health." A series of such papers covering the various trades and showing the physical conditions existing in them would be of very great value. The only attempt to really discuss the problems of labor in anything approaching a broad way is to be found in the final chapters on "Employers' Liabilities," "Workingmen's Insurance in Germany," and "Insurance Against Unemployment." There is no presentation of any criticism of the wage system as such, no discussion of the movement of unions toward political action, no consideration of the effects of consolidation of capital in the form of Employers' Associations, Civic Federations, etc., upon the working class. As a reference book, however, it occupies a peculiarly valuable place, bringing together as it does a great variety of information from so many sources.

A KNIGHT OF THE TOILERS, *by Arthur Newell.* T. L. Marsh and Co., Philadelphia, Cloth, 270 pp.

A social novel in many ways unique. It is one of those in which the preaching transcends the plot, and yet without loss of interest. Indeed,

there is little to be called a plot. Trevor, the hero, and the trusted employe of a coal-magnate, is asked to become a party to a reduction of the wages of former competitors, now employes of Pattison, the coal trust owner, to the level of mere office men. He refuses the conditions of consolidation had contained a contract specifically providing against such a reduction. Trevor hands in his resignation and takes up work as a miner. He organizes the men on strictly "business lines." The money which would have gone into strike funds was invested in co-operative stores. As this capital grows a portion is finally invested in farm lands and when the great strike comes part of the miners go to work on the farms to feed the others. They use the most perfect machinery and produce enough to feed those who remain near the mines as pickets. When at last the mine owners are forced to surrender they are met with a claim for damages sustained, which they are forced to pay and are at last informed that the laborers propose to reduce the compensation of the capitalists down to the wages of superintendency. As a piece of clever writing, shrewd analysis and unique reasoning the book is remarkably good. If the author really means it as a piece of sober advice, indicating a possible line of development of labor organizations, within capitalism it is a subject to criticism. But if it is intended rather as a suggestion of a possible evolution along with the overthrow of the political power of capitalism and still more as an illustration of the workings of the present system it is a clever valuable work.

FRENZIED FINANCE: THE CRIME OF AMALGAMATED. *By Thomas W. Lawson, Ridgway, Thayer & Co. Cloth, 559 pages, \$1.50.*

The subject matter of this book is so familiar to our readers that it is useless to review it. There is a tendency at the present time, partly we believe a reflex of the capitalist comment, to belittle what Lawson has done. To read this book now when it has all become a matter of common knowledge and indeed an integral part of the public mind gives one the impression that these facts have always been known and commonly published, but if we open up any periodical publication, even the most radical outside of socialist ranks, of two years ago and compare it with those of to-day a tremendous difference is at once apparent. To be sure the fundamental cause of this difference has been the industrial evolution, but more than any other one individual Lawson must be credited with assisting in this development. The insurance scandals are now a matter of record, yet when Lawson wrote not a word had been published. It is very easy to point out his shortcomings. He writes fundamentally from the point of view of small investors, his attack after all is not on the capitalist "system," but on a system within capitalism, a system which is playing the game a little too strenuously for the class of small investors. Proceeding from this point of view there is little danger in predicting that Lawson will fall very flat when he comes to exploit his much advertised "Remedy." Nevertheless this book is by far the most important contribution to the great literature of exposure which marks the declining years of capitalism.

WHAT OF THE FUTURE. *By H. J. Darius. Defender Publishing Co., Philadelphia, Pa. Paper, 160 pages, 25 cents.*

An anti-catholic book, much after the character of the A. P. A. literature of ten years ago. Belongs in the same category with Calvinistic the-

ology and emotional revivalism on the one hand and Tom Payne and Ingersoll Atheism on the other. Has no conception of the social function played by religion and the effects of industrial conditions upon religious life.

WHY THE CHURCH OPPOSES SOCIALISM. *By Fred. D. Warren. Appeal to Reason. Paper, 36 pages, 5 cents.*

A compact valuable discussion of a special subject, is largely made up of quotations showing the attitude of the churches to the question of chattel slavery, with a short discussion of the relation of religion to industrial conditions.

BIBLE, BEER AND SOCIALISM. *By S. J. Brownson, M. D. Published by the author at Fayetteville, Ark. Paper, 36 pages, 10 cents.*

An argument to show that socialism presents the only solution of the liquor question; contains large numbers of "proof texts" to prove that "prohibition is contrary to the teachings of the Bible."

THE GRAIN TRUST EXPOSED. *Tom Worrall. The Public Publishing Co., Chicago. Paper, 211 pp., 50 cents.*

This is an interesting and quite valuable monograph on the working of the grain and elevator trust in Nebraska. So far as the historical portion is concerned the work is well done. When it comes to remedies we have the same old little dealer's attitude shouting for free competition. We have the same florid rhetoric of denunciation, the same cries that if the railroads would give us a chance we would be all right, which has been behind every Populist, Granger and middle class movement in general ever since there have been railroads and before that the howl was directed at some other "natural monopoly."

PUBLISHERS' DEPARTMENT

THE INTERNATIONAL LIBRARY OF SOCIAL SCIENCE.

This new library is a distinct advance on anything yet done in the way of socialist book-making in America. It contains only books of unquestioned value and presents them in a substantial and artistic form, while the price to our co-operators is just about a third of what such books would ordinarily cost if published by capitalist houses.

1. *The Changing Order*, by Dr. Oscar L. Triggs, was discussed editorially on page 504 of last month's REVIEW. It rounds out the socialist thought on a side thus far left almost untouched, the relation of the coming industrial democracy to the intellectual life.

2. *Better-World Philosophy*, by J. Howard Moore, is also reviewed in our issue of last month; see page 505. It is perhaps the clearest and best-balanced discussion of the whole philosophy of life, especially with reference to ethics, that has yet been written from the socialist view-point.

3. *The Universal Kinship*, by J. Howard Moore, is a book of much greater length than the one just mentioned, and starts out with an array of facts and logic that will make any thinking reader see that the evolution of man from lower forms of life is no longer a tentative theory but the only possible conclusion from things positively known. The author then goes on to prove that the mind of man as well as his body is the inevitable outcome of the universe in which he lives. In his concluding chapters he proceeds to draw certain conclusions regarding the ethical relationships of man to man and of the human race to other races. The style of the book is delightfully simple, and the entire work is well worthy of careful study.

3. *Principles of Scientific Socialism*, by Charles H. Vail, is generally recognized as the best popular statement of the International socialist position to be had in the English language. It has run through many editions, but this is the handsomest that has yet appeared.

5. *Some of the Philosophical Essays* of Joseph Dietzgen, is one of the most important additions to the literature available to American socialists that has been made for years. Dietzgen has long been recognized by European socialists as one of the founders of the socialist philosophy, and this book contains some of his most important writings. It will be ready for delivery about the last of April or first of May.

6. *Essays on the Materialistic Conception of History*, by Antonio Labriola, was published a little over two years ago, and is selling more rapidly than at the start. It is a book that requires close study, but it also repays close study. No one who wishes to understand socialism should be without it.

7. *Love's Coming-of-Age*, by Edward Carpenter, is now in its fourth American edition. It is beyond doubt the most satisfactory book yet published on the sex problem as affected by the great economic changes now in progress.

All these books except Volume 5 are now ready. They sell for a dollar a volume, postage included. Stockholders get them at 60c. post-paid or 50c. by express. We expect to have at least two more volumes to announce in next month's Review; meanwhile we ask every socialist to order these.

NEW VOLUMES IN THE STANDARD SOCIALIST SERIES.

12. *The Positive School of Criminology*. Three Lectures by Enrico Ferri delivered at the University of Naples. Translated by Ernest Untermann. The application of the Marxian theory of economic determinism has revolutionized the science of criminology, and Enrico Ferri, at once a university professor and one of the leading socialists of Europe, stands recognized by capitalists and socialists alike as the ablest representative of the new school of criminology. He recognizes crime as the necessary outgrowth of economic conditions, and discusses the best methods of dealing with it under capitalism, with a full recognition all the while that crime must last while capitalism lasts. This is a work that will interest every judge and lawyer, no matter how bitter an opponent of socialism, because it gives new facts that the judges and lawyers need in their business.

13. *The World's Revolutions*. By Ernest Untermann. This new work is far simpler and more popular in style than the author's "Science and Revolution," yet at the same time it is an equally important contribution to socialist thought. The titles of the chapters are:

- I. The Individual and the Universe.
- II. Primitive Human Revolutions.
- III. The Roman Empire and its Proletariat.
- IV. The Christian Proletariat and its Mission.
- V. Feudal Ecclesiasticism and its Disintegration.
- VI. The American Revolution and its Reflex in France.
- VII. Bourgeois Revolutions in Europe.
- VIII. The Proletarian World Movement.

14. *The Socialists, Who they Are and What they Stand for*. By John Spargo. This book, the first edition of which will be ready early in April, is on the whole the best book for general propaganda use that has yet been written. It is brief yet comprehensive. The style is clear enough to make easy reading for the uneducated, yet artistic enough to attract the educated. The type is exceptionally large and clear; the margins are wide while the size of the book is convenient for the pocket, and socialists will find it just the thing to lend until it is worn out. It is an uncompro-

misgiving statement of the principles of International Socialism, but it is written in a way to persuade rather than antagonize the American reader who comes to this book for his first impressions of the Socialists.

Ferri's book is now ready, and Untermann's will be ready about March 25. All the volumes in the Standard Socialist Series sell at fifty cents each postpaid; to stockholders thirty cents by mail or twenty-five cents by express.

THE TRIUMPH OF LIFE, BY WILHELM BOELSCHKE.

This, the fifth volume of the Library of Science for the Workers, which was first announced several months ago, will be ready by the time this issue of the INTERNATIONAL REVIEW is in the hands of its readers. The style of this book is even more absorbing than that of "The Evolution of Man," by the same author. In this work life, starting with the lowest organic forms and culminating in man, is shown gradually overcoming its environment and molding the inorganic world to suit its purposes. It is a book that should be studied by all who fear that materialism leads to a denial of the power of mind. The translation is by May Wood Simons. The original German work contained no illustrations, but our edition has a dozen engravings reproduced from Haeckel's "Art Forms in Nature," which are a decided help to the understanding of the text.

"The Making of the World," by Dr. Wilhelm Meyer, translated by Ernest Untermann, will be ready in April, and "Life and Death," by Dr. E. Teichmann, is being translated by A. M. Simons for publication a little later. These volumes in the Library of Science for the Workers sell at fifty cents a volume, with the usual discount to stockholders.

DAMAGED COPIES OF "THE ANCIENT LOWLY," VOLUME I.

As already announced, we have purchased from the heirs of C. Osborne Ward all unsold copies of his books. Among them are some two hundred copies of the first volume of "The Ancient Lowly" with the covers slightly damaged, not enough to affect the durability of the books, while in most cases the damage is so slight as to be scarcely noticeable. We secured these damaged copies at a special price, and we wish to realize on them at once, since our contract requires us to make a heavy payment to the Osborne Ward heirs on the tenth day of each month from April to June inclusive. These books retail for two dollars a volume, and the first volume is a complete work in itself, having been published separately long before the second volume was written.

We have a special limited offer to make to all the readers of THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW, which positively will not appear again and will not hold good after April 15, 1906. Up to that time we will send a damaged copy of The Ancient Lowly, Volume I, postpaid, for seventy cents, or by express with other books at purchaser's expense for fifty cents. After that time, the book can not be had for less than \$2.00 except that stockholders can have the usual discount. There are no damaged copies of Volume II.

THE COMPANY'S FINANCES.

The only cash contribution to the work of the publishing house during February was \$2.00 from Albert Smith of Maryland. The receipts from the sale of stock were \$215.40, from the sale of books \$1,049.45.

from the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW subscriptions and sales \$192.43. The receipts from book sales are encouraging in that the gross profit on the books sold is ample to cover the running expenses of the business, but we are putting so much money into the printing of new books at this time that it is very essential that the sales for March be much larger, in order that we may take care of the printing bills as fast as they come due. And it is also necessary that the receipts of the REVIEW be increased, if a deficit is to be avoided.

It is also almost certain that it will be necessary for us to remove to a new location during the month of April, for the reason that the rent on the rooms we now occupy has been raised to a prohibitory figure. We hope next month to announce that a satisfactory location has been secured. Meanwhile the fact should be noted that the expense of moving will require a large outlay of ready money, and also that this expense can be kept down by selling off as much as possible of the stock now on hand, especially the more bulky and less valuable portion of it. A new and complete catalogue will be sent by return mail to any one requesting it, and every socialist is urged to send in as large a book order as possible without delay.

We also ask every reader of the REVIEW who has not already done so to subscribe ten dollars to the capital stock of the publishing house. Those who can not spare ten dollars at one time may pay for the stock in ten monthly installments, and may purchase books at special prices from the start. Full particulars regarding the organization of the company are given in the new catalogue.

We do not ask any one to subscribe for more than one share of stock, because it is essential that the control of the publishing house be kept in a large body of socialist co-operators, and not in any small group of investors. But there are two ways in which a socialist with money can help our work along effectively. One is by direct cash contributions. During 1904 and 1905 such contributions were received to the amount of \$4,520.88. If a like sum could be contributed this year it would enable us to increase immensely the output of socialist books. The stock pays no dividends, and no individual connected with the publishing house draws more than ordinary wages. The debt to outsiders is paid, and any contributions will at once be applied to the enlargement of our work.

The other way in which a socialist can help with money is by lending it to the publishing house. We receive loans without interest payable on demand, and loans at four per cent interest payable on sixty days' notice. We do not offer large interest, because the publishing house is not run on a profit-making basis. THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW is run at a loss because it publishes matter essential to the socialist movement rather than the matter that might find the readiest sale. The prices of books to our co-operators are fixed at prices that will just about cover the expense of publication. The new capital that will be needed can not therefore come from future profits, and we can not pay high interest rates nor guarantee dividends on stock with the expectation of future profits. Every share of stock is sold on the distinct understanding that there probably will never be any dividends, and the new capital to enlarge the business is expected to come from the sale of this stock. Meanwhile, we can enlarge the business more rapidly by the help of a limited amount of money on the terms we are offering, on sixty days' call with interest at four per cent., or payable on demand without interest. Any questions regarding the management of the business from stockholders or those considering the investment of money in the publishing house will be cheerfully answered.